National Anti-Slavery Standard.

S. H. GAY, OLIVER JOHNSON, } ..... Editors.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY, Corresponding Editor.

VOL. XIV. NO. 41. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1854. WHOLE NO. 717.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, on Saturday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK. Terms, *Two Dollars* per annum. Printed, for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street, New York.

THE NEBRASKA QUESTION.

Speech of Hon. William H. Seward,

IN THE U. S. SENATE, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1854.

MR. PRESIDENT: The United States, at the close of the Revolution, rested southward on the St. Mary's, and westward on the Mississippi, and possessed a broad, unoccupied domain, circumscribed by those rivers, the Alleghany Mountains, and the great Northern lakes. The Constitution anticipated the division of this domain into States, to be admitted as members of the Union, but it neither provided for nor anticipated any enlargement of the national boundaries. The people, engaged in reorganizing their governments, improving their social systems, and establishing relations of commerce and friendship with other nations, remained many years content within their apparently ample limits. But it was already foreseen that the free navigation of the Mississippi would soon become an urgent public want.

France, although she had lost Canada, in chivalrous battle, on the Heights of Abraham, in 1759, nevertheless, still retained her ancient territories on the western bank of the Mississippi. She had also, just before the breaking out of her own fearful revolution, re-acquired, by a secret treaty, the possessions on the Gulf of Mexico, which, in a recent war, had been wrested from her by Spain. Her first Consul, among those brilliant achievements which proved him the first Statesman as well as the first Captain of Europe, sagaciously sold the whole of these possessions to the United States, for a liberal sum, and thus replenished his treasury, while he saved from his enemies, and transferred to a friendly power, distant and vast regions, which, for want of adequate naval force, he was unable to defend.

This purchase of Louisiana from France by the United States involved a grave dispute concerning the western limits of that province; and this controversy, having remained open until 1819, was then adjusted by a treaty in which they relinquished Texas to Spain, and accepted a cession of the early-discovered and long-inhabited provinces of East Florida and West Florida. The United States stipulated, in each of these cases, to admit the countries thus annexed into the Federal Union.

The acquisitions of Oregon, by discovery and occupation of Texas, by her voluntary annexation, and of New Mexico and California, including what is now called Utah, by war, completed that rapid course of enlargement, at the close of which our frontier has been fixed near the centre of what was New Spain, on the Atlantic side of the continent, while on the West, as on the East, only an ocean separates us from the nations of the old word. It is not in my way now to speculate on the question how long we are to rest on these advanced positions.

Slavery, before the Revolution, existed in all the thirteen Colonies, as it did also in all the other European plantations in America. But it had been forced by British authority, for political and commercial ends, on the American People, against their own sagacious instincts of policy, and their stronger feelings of justice and humanity.

They had protested and remonstrated against the system, earnestly, for forty years, and they ceased to protest and remonstrate against it only when they finally committed their entire cause of complaint to the arbitrament of arms. An earnest spirit of emancipation was abroad in the Colonies at the close of the Revolution, and all of them, except, perhaps, South Carolina and Georgia, anticipated, desired and designed the early removal of the system from the country. The suppression of the African Slave Trade, which was universally regarded as ancillary to that great measure, was, not without much reluctance, postponed until 1808.

While there was no national power, and no claim or desire for national power, anywhere, to compel involuntary emancipation in the States where Slavery existed, there was at the same time a very general desire and a strong purpose to prevent its introduction into new communities yet to be formed, and into new States yet to be established. Mr. Jefferson proposed, as early as 1784, to exclude it from the national domain which should be constituted by cessions from the States to the United States. He recommended and urged the measure as ancillary, also, to the ultimate policy of emancipation. There seems to have been at first no very deep jealousy between the emancipation and the non-emancipating States; and the policy of admitting new States was not disturbed by questions concerning Slavery. Vermont, a non-slaveholding State, was admitted in 1793. Kentucky, a tramontane slaveholding community, having been detached from Virginia, was admitted without being questioned; about the same time. So, also, Tennessee, which was a similar community separated from North Carolina, was admitted in 1796, with a stipulation that the ordinance which Mr. Jefferson had first proposed, and which had in the meantime been adopted by the Territory north-west of the Ohio, should not be held to apply within her limits. The same course was adopted in organizing Territorial Governments for Mississippi and Alabama, slaveholding communities which had been detached from South Carolina and Georgia. All these States and Territories were situated south-west of the Ohio River, all were more or less already peopled by slaveholders with their slaves; and to have excluded Slavery within their limits would have been a national act, not of preventing the introduction of Slavery, but of abolishing Slavery. In short, the region south-west of the Ohio River presented a field in which the policy of preventing the introduction of Slavery was impracticable. Our forefathers never attempted what was impracticable.

But the case was otherwise in that fair and broad region which stretched away from the banks of the Ohio, northward to the lakes, and westward to the Mississippi. It was yet free, or practically free, from the presence of slaves, and was nearly uninhabited, and quite unoccupied. There was then no Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, no Erie Railroad, no New York Central Railroad, no Boston and Ogdensburgh Railroad; there was no railway through Canada; nor, indeed, any road around or across the mountains; no imperial Erie Canal, no Welland Canal, no lockages around the rapids and the falls of the St. Lawrence, the Mohawk and the Niagara Rivers, and no steam navigation on the lakes, or on the Hudson, or on the Mississippi. There, in that remote and secluded region, the prevention of the introduction of Slavery was possible; and there our forefathers, who left no possible national good unattempted, *did* prevent it. It makes one's heart bound with joy and gratitude, and lift itself up with mingled pride and veneration, to read the history of that great transaction. Discarding the trite and common forms of expressing the national will, they did not merely "vote," or "resolve," or "enact," as on other occasions, but they "ORDAINED," in language marked at once with precision, amplification, solemnity and emphasis, that there "shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." And they further ORDAINED and declared that this law should be considered a COMPACT between the original States and the People and States of said territory, and forever remain unalterable, unless by common consent. The Ordinance was agreed to unanimously. Virginia, in re-affirming her cession of the territory, ratified it, and the first Congress held under the Constitution solemnly renewed and confirmed it.

In pursuance of this Ordinance, the several Territorial Governments successively established in the North-west Territory were organized with a prohibition of the introduction of Slavery, and in due time, though at successive periods, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, States erected within that Territory, have come into the Union with Constitutions in their hands forever prohibiting Slavery and involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime. They are yet young; but, nevertheless, who has ever seen elsewhere such States as they are! There are gathered the young, the vigorous, the active, the enlighted sons of every State—the flower and choice of every State in this broad Union; and there the emigrant for conscience' sake, and for freedom's sake, from every land in Europe, from proud and all-conquering Britain, from heart-broken Ireland, from sunny Italy, from beautiful France, from Spiritual Germany, from chivalrous Hungary, and from honest and brave old Sweden and Norway. Thence are already coming ample supplies of corn, and wheat, and wine, for the manufacturers of the East, for the planters of the tropics, and even for the artisans and the armies of Europe, and thence will continue to come in long succession, as they have already begun to come, statesmen and legislators for this continent.

Thus it appears, Mr. President, that it was the policy of our fathers, in regard to the original domain of the United States, to prevent the introduction of Slavery wherever it was practicable. This policy encountered greater difficulties when it came under consideration with a view to its establishment in regions not included within our original domain. While Slavery had been actually abolished already by some of the emancipating States, several of them, owing to a great change in the relative value of the productions of slave labour, had fallen off into the class of non-emancipating States; and now the whole family of States was divided and classified as slaveholding or slave States, and non-slaveholding or free States. A rivalry for political ascendancy was soon developed, and, beside the motives of interest and philanthropy which had before existed, there was now on each side a desire to increase, from among the candidates for admission into the Union, the number of States in their respective classes, and so their relative weight and influence in the Federal Councils.

The country which had been acquired from France was, in 1804 organized in two territories, one of which, including New Orleans as its capital, was called Orleans, and the other, having St. Louis for its chief town, was called Louis. In 1812, the territory of Orleans was admitted as a new State, under the name of Louisiana. It had been an old slaveholding colony of France, and the interdiction of Slavery within it would have been a simple act of Abolition. At the same time, the Territory of Louisiana, by authority of Congress, took the name of Missouri; and, in 1819, the portion thereof which now constitutes the State of Arkansas was detached, and became a territory, under that name. In 1819, Missouri, which was then but thinly peopled, and had an inconsiderable number of slaves, applied for admission into the Union, and her application brought the question of extending the policy of the Ordinance of 1787, to the State, and to other new States in the region acquired from Louisiana, to a direct issue. The House of Representatives insisted on a prohibition against the further introduction of Slavery in the State, as a condition of her admission. The Senate disagreed with the House in that demand. The non-slaveholding States sustained the House, and the slaveholding States sustained the Senate. The difference was radical, and tended toward revolution.

The party maintained that the condition demanded was constitutional, the other that it was unconstitutional. The public mind became excited, and painful apprehensions of disunion and civil war began to prevail in the country.

In this crisis, a majority of both Houses agreed upon a plan for the adjustment of the controversy. By this plan, Maine, a non-slaveholding State, was to be admitted; Missouri was to be admitted without submitting to the condition before mentioned; and in all that part of the Territory acquired from France, which was north of the line of 36 deg. 30 min. of north latitude, Slavery was to be forever prohibited. Louisiana, which was a part of that Territory, had been admitted as a slave State eight years before; and now, not only was Missouri to be admitted as a slave State, but Arkansas, which was south of that line, by strong implication, was also to be admitted as a slaveholding State. I need not indicate what were the equivalents which the respective parties were to receive in this arrangement, further than to say that the slaveholding States practically were to receive slaveholding States, the free States to receive a desert, a solitude, in which they might, if they could, plant the germs of future free States. This measure was adopted. It was a great national transaction—the first of a class of transactions which have since come to be thoroughly defined and well understood, under the name of compromises. My own opinions concerning them are well known, and are not in question here. According to the general understanding, they are marked by peculiar circumstances and features, viz.:

First: there is a division of opinion upon some vital national question between the two Houses of Congress, which division is irreconcilable, except by mutual concessions of interests and opinions, which the Houses deem constitutional and just.

Secondly: they are rendered necessary by impending calamities, to result from the failure of legislation, and not to be otherwise averted than by such mutual concessions, or sacrifices.

Thirdly: such concessions are mutual and equal, or are accepted as such, and so become conditions of the mutual arrangement.

Fourthly: by this mutual exchange of conditions, the transaction takes on the nature and condition of a contract, compact, or treaty, between the parties represented; and so, according to well settled principles of morality and public law, the statute which embodies it is understood, by those who uphold this system of legislation, to be irrevocable and irrepealable, except by the mutual consent of both or of all the parties concerned. Not, indeed, that it is absolutely irrepealable, but that it cannot be repealed without a violation of honour, justice and good faith, which it is presumed will not be committed.

Such was the Compromise of 1820. Missouri came into the Union immediately as a slaveholding State, and Arkansas came in as a slaveholding State, without objection, eight years afterward. Nebraska, the part of the Territory reserved exclusively for free Territories and free States, has remained a wilderness ever since. And now it is proposed here to abrogate, not, indeed, the whole Compromise, but only that part of it which saved Nebraska as free Territory, to be afterward divided into non-slaveholding States, which should be admitted into the Union. And this is proposed, notwithstanding an universal acquiescence in the Compromise, by both parties, for thirty years, and its confirmation, over and over again, by many acts of successive Congresses, and notwithstanding that the slaveholding States have peaceably enjoyed, ever since it was made, all their equivalents, while, owing to circumstances which will hereafter appear, the non-slaveholding States have not practically enjoyed any of those guaranteed to them.

This is the question now before the Senate of the United States of America.

It is a question of transcendent importance. The proviso of 1820, to be abrogated in Nebraska, is the Ordinance of the Continental Congress of 1787, extended over a new part of the national domain, acquired under our present Constitution. It is rendered venerable by its antiquity, and sacred by the memory of that Congress, which, in surrendering its trust, after establishing the Ordinance, enjoined it upon posterity always to remember that the cause of the United States was the cause of human nature. The question involves an issue of public faith, and national morality and honour. It will be a sad day for this Republic when such a question shall be deemed unworthy of grave discussion and intense interest. Even if it were certain that the inhibition of Slavery in the region concerned was unnecessary, and if the question was thus reduced to a mere abstraction, yet even that abstraction would involve the testimony of the United States on the expediency, wisdom, morality and justice of the system of human bondage with which this and other portions of the world have been so long afflicted, and it will be a melancholy day for the Republic and for mankind when her decision on even such an abstraction shall command no respect and inspire no hope in the hearts of the oppressed. But it is no such abstraction. It was no unnecessary dispute, no mere contest of blind passion, that brought that Compromise into being. Slavery and Freedom were active antagonists then seeking for ascendancy in this Union. Both Slavery and Freedom are more vigorous, active and self-aggranditing now than they were then, or ever were before or since that period. The contest between them has been only protracted, not decided. It is a great feature in our national Hereafter. So the question of adhering to or abrogating this Compromise is no unmeaning issue, and no contest of mere blind passion now.

To adhere, is to secure the occupation by free men, with free labour, of a region in the very centre of the continent, capable of sustaining, and in that event destined, though it may be only after a far-distant period, to sustain ten, twenty, thirty, forty millions of people, and their successive generations forever!

To abrogate, is to resign all that vast region to chances which mortal vision cannot fully foresee; perhaps to the sovereignty of such stinted and short-lived communities as those of which Mexico and South America and the West India Islands present us with examples; perhaps to convert that region into the scene of long and desolating conflicts between not merely races, but castes, to end, like a similar conflict in Egypt, in a convulsive exodus of the oppressed people, despoiling their superiors; perhaps, like one not dissimilar in Spain, in the forcible expulsion of the inferior race, exhausting the State by the sudden and complete suppression of a great resource of national wealth and labour; perhaps in the disastrous expulsion, even of the superior race itself, by a people too suddenly raised from Slavery to Liberty, as in St. Domingo. To adhere, is to secure forever the presence here, after some lapse of time, of two, four, ten, twenty, or more Senators, and of Representatives in larger proportions, to uphold the policy and interests of the non-slaveholding Slates, and balance that ever-increasing representation of slaveholding States, which past experience, and the decay of the Spanish American States, admonish us has only just begun; to save what the non-slaveholding States have in mints, navy yards, the military academy and fortifications, to balance against the capital and federal institutions in the slaveholding States; to save against any danger from adverse or hostile policy, the culture, the manufactures, and the commerce, as well as the just influence and weight of the national principles and sentiments of the slaveholding States. To adhere, is to save to the non-slaveholding States, as well as to the slaveholding States, always, and in every event, a right of way and free communication across the continent, to and with the States on the Pacific coasts, and with the rising States on the islands in the South Sea, and with all the eastern nations on the vast continent of Asia.

To abrogate, on the contrary, is to commit all these precious interests to the chances and hazards of embarrassment and injury by legislation, under the influence of social, political and commercial jealously and rivalry; and, in the event of the secession of the slaveholding States, which is so often threatened in their name—but I thank God without their authority—to give to a servile population a La Vendee at the very sources of the Mississippi, and in the very recesses of the Rocky Mountains.

Nor is this last a contingency against which a statesman, when engaged in giving a constitution for such a territory, so situated, must veil his eyes. It is a statesman's province and duty to look before as well as after. I know, indeed, the present loyalty of the American people, North and South, and East and West. I know that it is a sentiment stronger than any sectional interest or ambition, and stronger than even the love of equality in the non-slaveholding States; and stronger, I doubt not, than the love of Slavery in the slaveholding States. But I do not know, and no mortal sagacity does know, the seductions of interest and ambition, and the influences of passion, which are yet to be matured in every region. I know this, however: that this Union is safe now, and that it will be safe so long as impartial political equality shall constitute the basis of society, as it has heretofore done in even half of these States, and they shall thus maintain a just equilibrium against the slaveholding States. But I am well assured, also, on the other hand, that if ever the slaveholding States shall multiply themselves, and extend their sphere, so that they could, without association with the non-slaveholding States, constitute of themselves a commercial republic, from that day their rule, through the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative powers of the Government, will be such as will be hard for the non-slaveholding States to bear; and their pride and ambition, since they are congregations of men, and are moved by human passions, will consent to no Union in which they shall not so rule.

The slaveholding States already possess the mouths of the Mississippi, and their territory reaches far northward along its banks, on one side of the Ohio and on the other even to the confluence of the Missouri. They stretch their dominions now from the banks of the Delaware quite around bay, headland and promontory to the Rio Grande. They will not stop, although they now think they may, on the summit of the Sierra Nevada; nay, their armed pioneers are already in Sonora, and their eyes are already fixed, never to be taken off, on the island of Cuba, the Queen of the Antilles. If we of the non-slaveholding States surrender to them now the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, and the very sources of the Mississippi, what territory will be secure, what territory can be secured hereafter, for the creation and organization of free States within our ocean-bound domain? What territory on this continent will remain unappropriated and unoccupied for us to annex? What territories, even if we are able to buy or conquer them from Great Britain or Russia, will the slaveholding States suffer, much less aid, us to annex, to restore the equilibrium which by this unnecessary measure we shall have so unwisely, so hurriedly, so suicidally subverted?

Now am I to be told that only a few slaves will enter into this vast region? One slaveholder in a new Territory, with access to the Executive ear at Washington, exercises more political influence than five hundred freemen. It is not necessary that all or a majority of the citizens of a State shall be slaveholders to constitute a slaveholding State. Delaware has only 2,000 slaves, against 91,000 freemen; and yet Delaware is a slaveholding State. The proportion is not substantially different in Maryland and Missouri, and yet they are slaveholding States. These, sir, are the stakes in this legislative game, in which I lament to see, that while the representatives of the slaveholding States are unanimously and earnestly playing to win, so many of the representatives of the non-slaveholding States are with even greater zeal and diligence playing to lose.

Mr. President, the Committee who have recommended these twin bills for the organization of the Territories of Nebraska and Kanzas hold the affirmative in the argument upon their passage.

What is the case they present to the Senate and the country?

They have submitted a report; but that report, brought in before they had introduced or even conceived this bold and daring measure of abrogating the Missouri Compromise, directs all its arguments against it.

The Committee say, in their report:

"Such being the character of the controversy, in respect to the territory acquired from Mexico, a similar question has arisen in regard to the right to hold slaves in the proposed Territory of Nebraska, when the Indian laws shall be withdrawn, and the country thrown open to emigration and settlement. By the 8th section of 'an act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the admission of such States into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit Slavery in certain Territories,' approved March 6, 1820, it was provided: 'That, in all that Territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, Slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and is hereby, forever prohibited: *Provided always*, That any person escaping into the same, from whom labour or service is lawfully claimed, in any State or Territory in the United States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labour or service as aforesaid.'

"Under this section, as in the case of the Mexican law in New Mexico and Utah, it is a disputed point whether Slavery is prohibited in the Nebraska country by valid enactment. The decision of this question involves the constitutional power of Congress to pass laws prescribing and regulating the domestic institutions of the various Territories of the Union. In the opinion of those eminent Statesmen who hold that Congress is not invested with rightful authority to legislate upon the subject of Slavery in the Territories, the 8th section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri is null and void; while the prevailing sentiment in large portions of the Union sustains the doctrine that the Constitution of the United States secures to every citizen an inalienable right to move into any of the Territories with his property, of whatever kind and description, and to hold and enjoy the same under the sanction of the law. Your Committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into the discussion of these controverted questions. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife, and the fearful struggle of 1850. As Congress deemed it wise and prudent to refrain from deciding the matters in controversy then, either by affirming or repealing the Mexican laws, or by an act declaratory of the true intent of the Constitution, and the extent of the protection afforded by it to slave property in the Territories, so your Committee are not prepared now to recommend a departure from the course pursued on that memorable occasion, either by affirming or repealing the 8th section of the Missouri Act, or by any act declaratory of the meaning of the Constitution in respect to the legal point in dispute."

This report gives us the deliberate judgment of the Committee on two important points. First, that the Compromise of 1850 did not, by its letter or by its spirit, repeal, or render necessary, or even propose, the abrogation of the Missouri Commpromise, and, secondly, that the Missouri Compromise ought not now to be abrogated. And now, Sir, what do we next hear from this Committee; First, two similar and kindred bills, actually abrogating the Missouri Compromise, which, in their report, they had told us ought not to be abrogated at all! Secondly, these bills declare on their face, in substance, that that Compromise was already abrogated by the spirit of that Compromise of 1850, which, in their report, they had just shown us, left the Compromise of 1820 absolutely unaffected and unimpaired. Thirdly, the Committee favour us, by their chairman, with an oral explanation, that the amended bills abrogating the Missouri Compromise are identical with their previous bill, which did not abrogate it, and are only made to differ in phraseology, to the end that the provisions contained in their previous and now discarded bill shall be absolutely clear and certain!

I entertain great respect for the Committee itself, but I must take leave to say that the inconsistencies and self-contradictions contained in the papers it has given us have destroyed all claims, on the part of those documents, to respect, here or elsewhere. (Here there was a burst of applause in the galleries.)

The recital of the effect of the Compromise of 1850 upon the Compromise of 1820, as finally revised, corrected, and amended, here in the face of the Senate, means, after all, substantially what that recital meant as it stood before it was perfected, or else it means nothing tangible or worthy of consideration at all. What if the spirit, or even the letter, of the Compromise laws of 1850 did conflict with the Compromise of 1820? The Compromise of 1820 was, by its very nature, a Compromise irrepealable and unchangeable, without a violation of honour, justice and good faith. The Compromise of 1850, if it impaired the previous Compromise to the extent of the loss to free labour of one acre of the Territory of Nebraska, was either absolutely void, or ought, in all subsequent legislation, to be deemed and held void.

What if the spirit or the letter of the Compromise was a violation of the Compromise of 1820? Then, inasmuch as the Compromise of 1820 was inviolable, the attempted violation of it shows that the so-called Compromise of 1850 was to that extent not a Compromise at all, but a factitious, spurious, and pretended Compromise. What if the letter or the spirit of the Compromise of 1850 did supersede or impair or even conflict with the Compromise of 1820? Then that is a reason, not for abrogating the irrepealable and inviolable Compromise of 1820, but the spurious and pretended Compromise of 1850.

Mr. President, why is this reason for the proposed abrogation of the Compromise of 1820 assigned in these bills at all? It is unnecessary. The assignment of a reason adds nothing to the force or weight of the abrogation itself. Either the fact alleged as a reason is *true* or it is *not* true. If it be untrue, your asserting it here will not make it true. If it be true, it is apparent in the text of the law of 1850, without the aid of legislative exposition now. It is unusual. It is unparliamentary. The language of the lawgiver, whether the sovereign be democratic, republican, or despotic, is always the same. It is mandatory, imperative. If the lawgiver explains at all in a statute the reason for it, the reason is that it is his pleasure—*sic volo, sic jubeo*. Look at the Compromise of 1820. Does it plead an excuse for its commands? Look at the Compromise of 1850, drawn by the master hand of our American Chatham. Does that bespeak your favour by a quibbling or shuffling apology? Look at your own, now rejected, first Nebraska bill, which, by conclusive implication, saved the effect of the Missouri Compromise. Look at any other bill ever reported by the Committee on Territories. Look at any other bill now on your calendar; examine all the laws on your statute books. Do you find any one bill or statute which ever came bowing, stooping, and wriggling into the Senate, pleading an excuse for its clear and explicit declaration of the sovereign and irresistible will of the American People? The departure from this habit in this solitary case betrays self-distrust, and an attempt on the part of the bill to divert the public attention, to raise complex and immaterial issues, to perplex and bewilder and confound the People by whom this transaction is to be reviewed. Look again at the vacillation betrayed in the frequent changes of the structure of this apology. At first the recital told us that the 8th section of the Compromise act of 1820 was superseded by the principles of the Compromise laws of 1850—as if any one had ever heard of a supersedeas of one local law by the mere *principles* of another local law enacted for an altogether different region, thirty years afterward. On another day, we were told, by an amendment of the recital, that the Compromise of 1820 was not superseded by the Compromise of 1850 at all, but was only only "inconsistent with" it—as if a local act which was irrepealable was now be be abrogated, because it was inconsistent with a subsequent enactment, which had no application whatever within the region to which the first enactment was confined. On a third day, the meaning of the recital was further and finally elucidated by an amendment, which declared that the first irrepealable act protecting Nebraska from Slavery was now declared "inoperative and void," because it was inconsistent with the present purposes of Congress not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom.

But take this apology in whatever form it may be expressed, and test its logic by a simple process.

The law of 1820 secured free institutions in the regions acquired from France in 1803 by the wise and prudent foresight of the Congress of the United States. The law of 1850, on the contrary, committed the choice between free and slave institutions in New Mexico and Utah—territories acquired from Mexico nearly fifty years afterward—to the interested cupidity or the caprice of their earliest and accidental occupants. Free institutions and slave institutions are equal, but the interested cupidity of the pioneer is a wiser arbiter, and his judgment a surer safeguard, than the collective wisdom of the American people and the most solemn and time-honoured statute of the American Congress. Therefore, let the law of freedom in the territory acquired from France be now annulled and abrogated, and let the fortunes and fate of Freedom and Slavery, in the region acquired from France, be, henceforward, determined by the votes of some seven hundred camp followers around Fort Leavenworth, and the still smaller number of trappers, Government schoolmasters, and mechanics, who attend the Indians in their seasons of rest from hunting in the passes of the Rocky Mountains. Sir, this syllogism may satisfy you and other Senators; but as for me, I must be content to adhere to the earlier system *Stare super antiquas vias.*

There is yet another difficulty in this new theory. Let it be granted that, in order to carry out a new principle recently adopted in New Mexico, you can supplant a compromise in Nebraska, yet there is a maxim of public law which forbids you from supplanting that Compromise, and establishing a new system *there*, until you first restore the parties in interest there to their *statu quo* before the Compromise to be supplanted was established. First, then, remand Missouri and Arkansas back to the unsettled condition, in regard to Slavery, which they held before the Compromise of 1820 was enacted, and then we will hear you talk of rescinding that Compromise. You cannot do this. You ought not to do it, if you could; and because you cannot and ought not to do it, you cannot, without violating law, justice, equity and honour, abrogate the guarantee of freedom in Nebraska.

There is still another and not less serious difficulty. You call the Slavery laws of 1820 a compromise between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. For the purpose of this argument, let it be granted that they were such a compromise. It was nevertheless a compromise concerning Slavery in the Territories acquired from Mexico, and by the letter of the compromise it extended no further. Can you now, by any act which is not a compromise between the same parties, but a mere ordinary law, extend the force and obligation of the principles of that Compromise of 1850 into regions not only excluded from it, but absolutely protected from your intervention there by a solemn compromise of thirty years' duration, and invested with a sanctity scarcely inferior to that which hallows the Constitution itself?

Can the Compromise of 1850, by a mere ordinary act of legislation, be extended beyond the plain, known, fixed intent and understanding of the parties at the time that contract was made, and yet be binding on the parties to it, not merely legally, but in honour and conscience? Can you abrogate a compromise by passing any law of less dignity than a compromise? If so, of what value is any one or the whole of the Compromises? Thus you see that these bills violate both of the Compromises—not more that of 1820 than that of 1850.

Will you maintain in argument that it was understood by the parties interested throughout the country, or by either of them, or by any representative of either, in either House of Congress, that the principle then established should extend beyond the limits of the territories acquired from Mexico, into the territories acquired, nearly fifty years before, from France, and then reposing under the guarantee of the Compromise of 1820? I know not how Senators may *vote*, but I do know what they will *say*. I appeal to the honourable Senator from Michigan (Mr. Cass), than whom none performed a more distinguished part in establishing the Compromise of 1850, whether he so intended or understood. I appeal to the honourable and distinguished Senator, the senior representative from Tennessee (Mr. Bell), who performed a distinguished part also. Did he so understand the Compromise of 1850? I appeal to that very distinguished—nay, Sir, that expression falls short of his eminence—the illustrious man, the Senator from Missouri, who led the opposition here to the Compromise of 1850. Did he understand that that Compromise in any way overreached or impaired the Compromise of 1820? Sir, that distinguished person, while opposing the combination of the several laws on the subject of California and the territories, and Slavery, together, in one bill, so as to constitute a compromise, nevertheless voted for each one of those bills, severally; and in that way and that way only, they were passed. Had he known or understood that any one of them overreached and impaired the Missouri Compromise, we all know he would have perished before he would have given it his support.

Sir, if it was not irreverent, I would dare to call up the author of both of the Compromises in question, from his honoured, though yet scarcely grass-covered grave, and challenge any advocate of this measure to confront that imperious shade, and say, that in making the Compromise of 1850, he intended or dreamed that he was subverting, or preparing the way for a subversion, of his greater work of 1820. Sir, if that eagle spirit is yet lingering here over the scene of his mortal labours, and watching over the welfare of the Republic he loved so well, his heart is now moved with more than human indignation against those who are perverting the last great public act from its legitimate uses, not merely to subvert the column, but to wrench from its very bed the base of the column that perpetuates his fame.

And that other proud and dominating Senator, who, sacrificing himself, gave the aid without which the Compromise of 1850 could not have been established—the statesman of New England, and the orator of America—who dare assert here, where his memory is yet fresh, though his unfettered spirit may be wandering in spheres far hence, that he intended to abrogate, or dreamed that, in virtue or in consequence of that transaction, the Missouri Compromise would or could ever be abrogated? The portion of the Missouri Compromise you propose to abrogate is the Ordinance of 1787 extended to Nebraska. Hear what Daniel Webster said of that Ordinance itself, in 1830, in this very place, in reply to one who had undervalued it and its author:

"I spoke, Sir, of the Ordinance of 1787, which prohibits Slavery, in all future time, northwest of the Ohio, as a measure of great wisdom and forethought, and one which has been attended with highly beneficial and permanent consequences."

And now hear what he said here, when advocating the Compromise of 1850:

"I now say, Sir, as the proposition upon which I stand this day, and upon the truth and firmness of which I intend to act till it is overthrown, that there is not at this moment in the United States, or any Territory of the United States, one single foot of land, the character of which, in regard to its being free Territory or slave Territory, is not fixed by some law, and some IRREPEALABLE law, beyond the power of the action of this Government."

What *irrepealable* law, or what law of any kind, fixed the character of Nebraska as free or slave Territory, except the Missouri Compromise act?

And now hear what Daniel Webster said when vindicating the Compromise of 1850, at Buffalo, in 1851:

"My opinion remains unchanged, that it was not within the original scope or design of the Constitution to admit new States out of foreign Territory; and for one, whatever may be said at the Syracuse Convention or any other assemblage of insane persons, I never would consent, and never have consented, that there should be one foot of slave Territory beyond what the old thirteen States had at the time of the formation of the Union! Never! Never!

"The man cannot show his face to me and say he can prove that I departed from that doctrine. He would sneak away, and slink away, or hire a mercenary press to cry out, What an apostate from Liberty Daniel Webster has become! But he knows himself to be a hypocrite and a falsifier."

The Compromise was forced upon the slaveholding States and upon the non-slaveholding States as a mutual exchange of equivalents. The equivalents were accurately defined, and carefully scrutinized and weighed by the respective parties through a period of eight months. The equivalents offered to the non-slaveholding States were: 1st, the admission of California; 2d, the abolition of the public slave trade in the District of Columbia. These, and these only, were the boons offered to them, and the only sacrifices which the slaveholding States were required to make. The waiver of the Wilmot Proviso in the incorporation of New Mexico and Utah, and a new fugitive slave law, were the only boons proposed to the slaveholding States, and the only sacrifices exacted of the non-slaveholding States. No other questions between them were agitated except those which were involved in the gain or loss of more or less of free territory or of slave territory in the determination of the boundary between Texas and New Mexico, by a line that was at last arbitrarily made, expressly saving even in *those Territories* to the respective parties their respective shares of free soil and slave soil according to the articles of annexation of the Republic of Texas. Again, there were alleged to be five open bleeding wounds in the Federal system, and *no more*, which needed surgery, and to which the Compromise of 1850 was to be a cataplasm. We all know what they were: California without a constitution, New Mexico in the grasp of Military power, Utah neglected, the District of Columbia dishonoured, and the rendition of fugitives denied. Nebraska was not even thought of in this catalogue of nationall ills. And now, Sir, did the Nashville Convention of secessionists understand that besides the enumerated boons offered to the slaveholding States they were to have also the obliteration of the Missouri Compromise line of 1820? If they did why did they reject and scorn and scout the Compromise of 1850? Did the legislatures and public assemblies of the non-slaveholding States, who made your table groan with their remonstrances understand that Nebraska was an additional wound to be healed by the Compromise of 1850? If they did, why did they omit to remonstrate against the healing of that too as well as of the other five by the cataplasm, the application of which they resisted so long.

Again: Had it been then known that the Missouri Compromise was to be abolished, directly or indirectly, by the Compromise of 1850, what representative from a non-slaveholding State would, at that day, have voted for it? Not one. What Senator from a slaveholding State would have voted for it? Not one. So entirely was it then unthought of that the new Compromise was to repeal the Missouri Compromise line of 36 deg. 30 min., in the region acquired from France, that one half of that long debate was spent on propositions made by representatives from slaveholding States to extend the line further on through the new territory we had so recently acquired from Mexico until it should disappear in the waves of the Pacific Ocean, so as to secure actual toleration of Slavery in all of this new territory that should be south of that line; and these propositions were resisted strenuously and successfully to the last by the representatives of the non-slaveholding States, in order, if it were possible, to save the whole of those regions for the theatre of free labour.

I admit that these are only negative proofs, although they are pregnant with conviction. But here is one which is not only affirmative, but positive, and not more positive than conclusive:

In the fifth section of the Texas Boundary bill, one of the acts constituting the Compromise of 1850, are these words:

"Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify anything contained in the third article of the second section of the joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States, approved March 1, 1845, either as regards the number of States that may hereafter be formed out of the State of Texas or otherwise."

What was that third article of the second section of the joint resolution for annexing Texas? Here it is:

"New States, of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without Slavery, as the people of such State asking admission may desire. And in such State or States as shall be formed out of said territory north of said Missouri Compromise line, Slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited."

This article saved the Compromise of 1820, in express terms, overcoming any implication of its abrogation, which might, by accident or otherwise, have crept into the Compromise of 1850; and any inferences to that effect, that might be drawn from any such circumstance as that of drawing the boundary line of Utah so as to trespass on the territory of Nebraska, dwelt upon by the Senator from Illinois.

The proposition to abrogate the Missouri Compromise, being thus stripped of the pretence that it is only a re-iteration or a re-affirmation of a similar abrogation in the Compromise of 1850, or a necessary consequence of that measure, stands before us now upon its own merits, whatever they may be.

But here the Senator from Illinois challenges the assailants of these bills, on the ground that they were all opponents of the Compromise of 1850, and even of that of 1820. Sir, it is not my purpose to answer in person to this challenge. The necessity, reasonableness, justice and wisdom of those Compromises, are not in question here now. My own opinions on them were, at a proper time, fully made known. I abide the judgment of my country and mankind upon them. For the present, I meet the Committee who has brought this measure forward, on the field they themselves have chosen, and the controversy is reduced to two questions—1st. Whether, by letter or spirit, the Compromise of 1850 abrogated or involved a future abrogation of the Compromise of 1820? 2d. Whether this abrogation can now be made consistently with honour, justice, and good faith? As to my right, or that of any other Senator, to enter these lists, the credentials filed in the Secretary's office settles that question. Mine bear a seal, as broad and as firmly fixed there as any other, by a people as wise, as free, and as great, as any one of all the thirty-one Republics represented here.

But I will take leave to say, that an argument merely *ad personam* seldom amounts to anything, more than an argument *ad captandum*. A life of approval of compromises, and of devotion to them, only enhances the obligation faithfully to fulfil them. A life of disapprobation of the policy of compromises only renders one more earnest in exacting fulfillment of them, when good and cherished interests are secured by them.

Thus much for the report and the bills of the Committee, and for the positions of the parties in this debate. A measure so bold, so unlooked for, so startling, and yet so pregnant as this, should have some plea of necessity. Is there any such necessity? On the contrary, it is not necessary now, even if it be altogether wise, to establish Territorial Governments in Nebraska. Not less than eighteen tribes of Indians occupy that vast tract, fourteen of which, I am informed, have been removed there by our own act, and invested with a fee simple to enjoy a secure and perpetual home, safe from the intrusion and the annoyance, and even from the *presence*, of the white man, and under the paternal care of the Government, and with the instruction of its teachers and mechanics, to acquire the arts of civilization, and the habits of social life. I will not say that this was done to prevent that territory, because denied to Slavery, from being occupied by free white men, and cultivated with free white labour; but I will say, that this removal of the Indians there under such guarantees has had that effect. The territory cannot be occupied now, any more than heretofore, by savages and white men, with or without slaves, together. Our experience and our Indian policy

establishing Territorial Governments in Nebraska, but that, on the contrary, these bills, establishing such governments, are only a vehicle for carrying, or a pretext for carrying, that act of abrogation.

It is alleged that the non-slaveholding States have forfeited their rights in Nebraska, under the Missouri Compromise, by first-breaking that compromise themselves. The argument is, that the Missouri Compromise line of 36 deg. 30 min., in the region acquired from France, although corresponding to that region which was our westernmost possession, was, nevertheless, understood as intended to be prospectively applied also to the territory reaching thence westward to the Pacific Ocean, which we should afterward acquire from Mexico; and that when afterward, having acquired these Territories, including California, New Mexico, and Utah, we were engaged in 1848 in extending Governments over them, the free States refused to extend that line, on a proposition to that effect made by the honourable Senator from Illinois.

It need only be stated, in refutation of this argument, that the Missouri Compromise law, like any other statute, was limited by the extent of the subject of which it treated. This subject was the Territory of Louisiana, acquired from France, whether the same were more or less, then in our lawful and peaceable position. The length of the line of 36 deg. 30 min., established by the Missouri Compromise, was the distance between the parallels of longitude which were the borders of that possession. Young America—I mean aggrandizing, conquering America—had not yet been born; nor was the statesman then in being who dreamed that, within thirty years afterward, we should have pushed our adventurous way not only across the Rocky Mountains, but also across the Snowy Mountains. Nor did any one then imagine that even if we should have done so within the period I have named, we were then prospectively carving up and dividing, not only the mountain passes, but the Mexican Empire on the Pacific coast, between freedom and Slavery. If such a proposition had been made then, and persisted in, we know enough of the temper of 1820 to know this, viz.: that Missouri and Arkansas would have stood outside of the Union until even this portentous day.

The time, for aught I know, may not be thirty years distant when the convulsions of the Celestial Empire and the decline of British sway in India shall have opened our way into the regions beyond the Pacific ocean. I desire to know now, and be fully certified of, the geographical extent of the laws we are now passing, so that there may be no such mistake hereafter as that now complained of here. We are now confiding to Territorial Legislatures the power to legislate on Slavery. Are the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas alone within the purvey of those acts? Or do they reach to the Pacific coast, and embrace also Oregon and Washington? Do they stop there, or do they take in China and India and Affghanistan, even to the gigantic base of the Himalaya Mountains? Do they stop there, or, on the contrary, do they encircle the earth, and, meeting us again on the Atlantic coast, embrace the islands of Iceland and Greenland, and exhaust themselves on the barren coasts of Greenland and Labrador?

Sir, if the Missouri Compromise neither in its spirit nor by its letter extended the line of 36 deg. 30 min. beyond the confines of Louisiana, or beyond the then confines of the United States, for the terms are equivalent, then it was no violation of the Missouri Compromise in 1848 to refuse to extend it to the subsequently acquired possessions of Texas, New Mexico, and California.

But suppose we did refuse to extend it; how did that refusal work a forfeiture of our vested rights under it? I desire to know that.

Again: If this forfeiture of Nebraska occurred in 1848, as the Senator charges, how does it happen that he not only failed in 1850, when the parties were in court here, adjusting their mutual claims, to demand judgment against the free States, but on the contrary, even urged that the same old Missouri Compromise line, yet held valid and sacred, should be extended through to the Pacific Ocean?

I come now to the chief ground of the defence of this extraordinary measure, which is, that it abolishes a geographical line of division between the proper fields of free labour and slave labour, and refers the claim between them to the people of the territories. Even if this great change of policy were actually wise and necessary, I have shown that it is not necessary to make it now, in regard to the territory of Nebraska. If it would be just elsewhere, it would be unjust in regard to Nebraska, simply because for ample and adequate equivalents, fully received, you have contracted in effect not to abolish that line there.

But why is this change of policy wise or necessary? It must be because either that the extension of Slavery is no evil, or because you have not the power to prevent it at all, or because the maintenance of a geographical line is no longer practicable.

I know that the opinion is sometimes advanced, here and elsewhere, that the extension of Slavery, abstractly considered, is not an evil; but our laws prohibiting the African Slave Trade are still standing on the statute book, and express the contrary judgment of the American Congress and of the American people. I pass on, therefore, from that point.

Sir, I do not like, more than others, a geographical line between Freedom and Slavery. But it is because I would have, if it were possible, all our Territory free. Since that cannot be, a line of division is indispensable; and any line is a geographical line.

The honourable and very acute Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Badger), has wooed us most persuasively to waive our own objections to the new principle as it is called of non-intervention by assuring us that the slaveholder can only use slave labour where the soils and climates favour the culture of tobacco, cotton, rice and sugar. None of them find these congenial soils or climates at the sources of the Mississippi or in the valley of the Rocky Mountains. Why then does he want to remove the inhibition there? But again that Senator reproduces a pleasing fiction of the character of Slavery from the Jewish history and asks why not allow the modern patriarchs to go into new regions with their slaves as their ancient prototypes did, to make them more comfortable and happy? and he tells us at the same time that this indulgence will not increase the slaves. I reply by asking, first, whether Slavery has gained or lost strength by the diffusion of it over a larger surface than it formerly covered? Will the Senator answer that? Secondly, I quite admire the simplicity of the patriarchal times; but they nevertheless exhibited some peculiar institutions quite incongruous with modern republicanism, not to say Christianity, namely, that of a latitude of construction of the marriage contract, which has been carried by one class of, so-called, patriarchs into Utah. Certainly no one would desire to extend that peculiar institution into Nebraska. Thirdly, slaveholders have also a peculiar institution which makes them political patriarchs—they make five of their slaves as equal to three freemen in forming the basis of federal representation. If these patriarchs insist upon carrying their institutions into new regions north of 36 deg. 30 min., I respectfully submit that they ought to reassume the modesty of their Jewish predecessors and relinquish this political feature of the system they thus seek to extend. Will they do that?

Some Senators have revived the argument that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional. But it is one of the peculiarities of compromises, that, constitutional objections, like all others, are buried under them by those who make and ratify them, for the obvious reason that the parties at once waive them, and receive equivalents. Certainly, the slaveholding States, which waived their Constitutional objections against the Compromise of 1820, and accepted equivalents therefor, cannot be allowed to revive and offer them now as a reason for refusing to the non-slaveholding States their rights under that Compromise, without first restoring the equivalents which they received on condition of surrendering their constitutional objections.

For argument's sake, however, let this reply be waived, and let us look at this Constitutional objection. You say that the exclusion of Slavery by the Missouri Compromise reaches through and beyond the existence of the region organized as a territory, and prohibits Slavery FOREVER, even in the States to be organized out of such Territory, while on the contrary, the States, when admitted, will be sovereign, and must have exclusive jurisdiction over Slavery for themselves. Let this, too, be granted. But Congress, according to the Constitution, "may admit new States." If Congress may admit, then Congress may also refuse to admit—that is to say, may reject new States. The greater includes the less; therefore Congress may admit, on condition that the States shall exclude Slavery. If such a condition should be accepted, would it not be binding?

It is by no means necessary, on this occasion, to follow the argument further to the question, whether such a condition is in conflict with the constitutional provision, that the new States received shall be admitted on an equal footing with the original States, because, in this case, and at present, the question relates not to the admission of a *State*, but to the organization of a Territory, and the exclusion of Slavery within the Territory while its *status* as a Territory shall continue, and no further. Congress has power to exclude Slavery in Territories, if they have any power to create, control, or govern Territories at all, for this simple reason: that, find the authority of Congress over the Territories wherever you may, there you find no exception from that general authority in favour of Slavery. If Congress has no authority over Slavery in the Territories, it has none in the District of Columbia. If, then, you abolish a law of freedom in Nebraska, in order to establish a new policy of abnegation, then true consistency requires that you shall also abolish the Slavery laws in the District of Columbia, and submit the question of the toleration of Slavery within the District to its inhabitants.

If you reply that the District of Columbia has no local or Territorial Legislature, then I rejoin, so also has not Nebraska, and so also has not Kansas. You are calling a Territorial Legislature into existence in Nebraska and another in Kansas, to assume the jurisdiction on the subject of Slavery, which you renounce. Then consistency demands that you call into existence a Territorial Legislature in the District of Columbia to assume the jurisdiction here, which you must also renounce. Will you do this? We shall see.

To come closer to the question: What is this principle of abnegating national authority on the subject of Slavery, in favour of the people? Do you abnegate all authority, whatever, in the Territories? Not at all; you abnegate only authority over Slavery there. Do you abnegate even that? No; you do not and you cannot. In the very act of abnegating you legislate, and enact that the States to be hereafter organized shall come in whether slave or free, as their inhabitants shall choose. Is not this legislating not only on the subject of Slavery in the Territories, but on the subject of Slavery even in the future States? In the very act of abnegating, you call into being a Legislature which shall assume the authority which you are renouncing. You not only exercise authority in that act, but you exercise authority over Slavery, when you confer on the Territorial Legislature the power to act upon that subject. More than this: In the very act of calling that Territorial Legislature into existence, you exercise authority in prescribing who may elect and who may be elected. You even reserve to yourselves a veto upon every act that they can pass a legislative body, not only on all other subjects, but even on the subject of Slavery itself. Nor can you relinquish that veto; for it is absurd to say that you can create an agent, and depute to him the legislative authority of the United States, which agent you cannot at your own pleasure remove, and whose acts you cannot at your own pleasure disavow and repudiate. The Territorial Legislature is your agent. Its acts are your own. Such is the principle that is to supplant the ancient policy—a principle full of absurdities and contradictions.

Again: You claim that this policy of abnegation is based upon a democratic principle. A democratic principle is a principle opposed to some other that is despotic or aristocratic. You claim and exercise the power to institute and maintain government in the Territories. Is this comprehensive power aristocratic or despotic? If it be not, how is the partial power aristocratic or despotic? You retain authority to appoint Governors, without whose consent no laws can be made on any subject, and Judges, without whose consideration no laws can be executed, and you retain the power to change them at pleasure. Are these powers, also, aristocratic or despotic? If they are not, then the exercise of legislative power by yourselves is not. If they are, then why not renounce them also? No, no. This is a far fetched excuse. Democracy is a simple, uniform, logical system, not a system of arbitrary, contradictory and conflicting principles!

But you must nevertheless renounce national authority over Slavery in the Territories, while you retain all other powers. What is this but a mere evasion of solemn responsibilities? The general authority of Congress over the Territories is one wisely confided to the National Legislature, to save young and growing communities from the dangers which beset them in their state of pupilage, and to prevent them from adopting any policy that shall be at war with their own lasting interests or with the general welfare of the whole Republic. The authority over the subject of Slavery is that which ought to be renounced last of all, in favour of Territorial Legislatures, because, from the very circumstances of the Territories, those Legislatures are likely to yield too readily to ephemeral influences and interested offers of favour and patronage. They see neither the great future of the Territories, nor the comprehensive and ultimate interests of the Republic as clearly as you see them, or ought to see them.

I have heard sectional excuses given for supporting this measure. I have heard Senators from the slaveholding States say that they ought not to be expected to stand by the non-slaveholding States, when they refuse to stand by themselves; that they ought not to be expected to refuse the boon offered to the slaveholding States, since it is offered by the non-slaveholding States themselves. I not only confess the plausibility of these excuses, but I feel the justice of the reproach which they imply against the non-slaveholding States, so far as the assumption is true. Nevertheless, Senators from the slaveholding States must consider well whether that assumption is, in any considerable degree, founded in fact. If one or more Senators from the North decline to stand by the non-slaveholding States, or offer a boon in their name, others from that region do, nevertheless, stand firmly on their rights, and protest against the giving or the acceptance of the boon. It has been said that the North does not speak out, so as to enable you to decide between the conflicting voices of her Representatives. Are you quite sure you have given her timely notice? Have you not, on the contrary, hurried this measure forward to anticipate her awaking from the slumber of conscious security into which she has been lulled by your last Compromise? Have you not heard already the quick, sharp protest of the Legislature of the smallest of the non-slaveholding States, Rhode Island? Have you not already heard the deep-toned and earnest protest of the greatest of those States, New York? Have you not already heard remonstrances from the metropolis, and from the rural districts? Do you doubt that this is only the rising of the agitation that you profess to believe is at rest forever? Do you forget that in all such transactions as these the People have a reserved right to review the acts of their Representatives, and a right to demand a re-consideration; that there is in our legislative practice a form of RE-ENACTMENT, as well as an act of *repeal;* and that there is in our political system provision not only for *abrogation*, but for RESTORATION also?

Senators from the slaveholding States: You are politicians as well as statesmen. Let me remind you, therefore, that political movements in this country as in all others, have their times of action and re-action. The pendulum moved on the side of Freedom in 1840, and swung back again in 1844, on the side of Slavery, traversed the dial in 1848, and touched even the mark of the Wilmot Proviso, and returned again in 1852, reaching even the height of the Baltimore Platform. Judge for yourselves whether it is yet ascending, and whether it will attain the height of the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise. That is the mark you are fixing for it. For myself, I may claim to know something of the North. I see in the changes of the times only the vibrations of the needle, trembling on its pivot. I know that in due time it will settle, and when it shall have settled it will point, as it must point forever, to the same constant polar star, that sheds down freedom broadly wherever it pours forth its mild, but invigorating light.

Mr. President, I have nothing to do, here or elsewhere, with personal or party motives. But I come to consider the motive which is publicly assigned for this transaction. It is a desire to secure permanent peace and harmony on the subject of Slavery, by removing all occasion for its future agitation in the Federal Legislature. Was there not peace already here? Was there not harmony as perfect as is ever possible in the country when this measure was moved in the Senate a month ago? Were we not and was not the whole nation, grappling with that one great common, universal interest, the opening of a communication between two ocean frontiers, and were we not already reckoning upon the quick and busy subjugation of nature throughout the interior of the continent to the uses of man, and dwelling with rapturous enthusiasm on the prospective enlargement of our commerce in the East, and of our political sway throughout the world? And what have we now here but the oblivion of death covering the very memory of those great enterprises, and prospects and hopes?

Senators from the slaveholding States: You want peace. Think well, I beseech you, before you yield the price now demanded, even for peace and rest from Slavery agitation. France has got peace from Republican agitation by a similar sacrifice. So has Poland; so has Hungary; and so at last, has Ireland. Is the peace which either of those nations enjoys worth the price it costs? Is peace obtained at such cost, ever a lasting peace?

Senators from the slaveholding States: You, too, suppose that you are securing peace as well as victory in this transaction. I tell you now as I told you in 1850, that it is an error, an unnecessary error to suppose, that because you exclude Slavery from these Halls today that it will not revisit them to-morrow. You buried the Wilmot Proviso here then, and celebrated its obsequies with pomp and revelry. And here it is again to-day, stalking through these halls, clad in complete steel as before. Even if those whom you denounce as factionists in the North would let it rest, you yourselves must evoke it from its grave. The reason is obvious. Say what you will, do what you will, here, the interests of the non-slaveholding States and of the slaveholding States remain just the same; and they *will* remain just the same, until you shall cease to honour and love Freedom! You will not cease to cherish Slavery. Do you see any sign that we are becoming indifferent to Freedom! On the contrary, that old, traditional, hereditary sentiment of the North is more profound and more universal now than it ever was before. The Slavery agitation you deprecate so much is an eternal struggle between Conservatism and Progress, between Truth and Error, between Right and Wrong. You may sooner, by act of Congress, compel the sea to suppress its upheavings, and the round earth to extinguish its internal fires, than oblige the human mind to cease its inquirings, and the human heart to desist from its throbbings.

Suppose, then, for a moment, that this agitation must go on hereafter as heretofore. Then hereafter as heretofore, there will be need, on both sides, of moderation, and to secure moderation there will be need of mediation. Hitherto you have secured moderation by means of compromises, by tendering which the great Mediator, now no more, divided the people of the North. But then those in the North who did not sympathise with you in your complaints of aggression from that quarter, as well as those who did, agreed that if compromises should be effected they would be chivalrously kept on your part. I cheerfully admit that they have been so kept until now. But hereafter, when having taken advantage, which in the North will be called fraudulent, of the last of those compromises, to become as you will be called the aggressors, by breaking the other, as will be alleged, in violation of plighted faith and honour, while the Slavery agitation is rising higher than ever before, and while your ancient friends, and those whom you persist in regarding as your enemies, shall have been driven together by a common and universal sense of your injustice, what new mode of restoring peace and harmony will you then propose? What statesman will there be in the South, then, who can bear the flag of truce? What statesman in the North who can mediate the acceptance of your new proposals?

If, however, I err in all this, let us suppose that you succeed in suppressing political agitation of Slavery in national affairs. Nevertheless, agitation of Slavery must go on in some form; for all the world around you is engaged in it. It is, then, high time for you to consider where you may expect to meet it next. I much mistake if, in that case, you do not meet it there where you, who once were slaveholding States, as you now are, have met, and happily for us, succumbed before it, namely, in the legislative halls, in the churches and schools, and at the firesides, within the States themselves. It is an angel with which, sooner or later, every slaveholding State must wrestle, and by which it must be overcome. Even if, by reason of this measure, it should the sooner come to that point, and although I am sure that you will not overcome Freedom, but that Freedom will overcome you, yet I do not look even then for disastrous or unhappy results. The institutions of our country are so framed, that the inevitable conflict of opinion on Slavery, as on every other subject, cannot be otherwise than peaceful in its course and beneficial in its termination.

Nor shall I "bate one jot of heart or hope," in maintaining a just equilibrium of the non-slaveholding States, even if this ill-starred measure shall be adopted. The non-slaveholding States are teeming with an increase of freemen, educated, vigorous, enlightened, enterprising freemen; such freemen as neither England, nor Rome, nor even Athens, ever reared. Half a million of freemen from Europe annually augment that increase; and, ten years hence, half a million; twenty years hence, a million of freemen from Asia will augment it still more. You may obstruct, and so turn the direction of those peaceful armies away from Nebraska. So long as you shall leave them room on hill or prairie; by river side or in the mountain fastnesses, they will dispose of themselves peacefully and lawfully in the places you shall leave open to them and there they will erect new States upon free soil, to be forever maintained and defended by free arms, and aggrandized by free labour. American Slavery, I know, has a large and ever-flowing spring, but it cannot pour forth its blackened tide in volumes like that I have described. If you are wise, these tides of freemen and of slaves will never meet, for they will not voluntarily commingle; but if, nevertheless, through your own erroneous policy, their repulsive currents must be directed against each other, so that they needs must meet, then it is easy to see, in that case, which of them will overcome the resistance of the other and which of them overpowered, will roll back to drown the sources which sent it forth.

"Man proposes, and God disposes." You may legislate and abrogate and abnegate as you will; but there is a superior Power that overrules all your actions and all your refusals to act, and I fondly hope and trust, overrules them to the advancement of the greatness and glory of our country—that overrules, I know, not only all your actions and all your refusels to act, but all human events, to the distant but inevitable result of the equal and universal liberty of man.

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION IN MICHIGAN.

PURSUANT to a call of the Anti-Slavery Convention published in the *Anti-Slavery Bugle* and other papers, to be held at the Union House, in Livonia, Wayne Co., Michigan, on Saturday and Sunday, the 4th and 5th of February, the Convention convened, and organized by appointing the following officers:

President—CYRUS FULLER, of Plymouth.

Vice-Presidents—Harriet D. G. Fuller, of Plymouth; John Briggs, of Farmington; Adolphus Brigham, of Mead's Mills.

Secretaries—Cynthia Walton, of Farmington; Richard Glasier, Jr., of Ann Arbor.

Business Committee—James W. Walker, Abby Kelly Foster, Edwin Fuller, Plymouth; Mr. Hedden, Plymouth; Mr. Packard, Plymouth; Warren Gilbert, Wolf Creek; Benjamin S. Jones, Thomas Chandler, Adrian.

Finance Committee—Emeline De Garmo, Ypsilanti; Lucenia A. Fuller, Plymouth; Ann Hayball, Adrian; Jacob Walton, Adrian.

The Chairman of the Business Committee reported resolutions 1st and 2d, which were discussed at length by James W. Walker, Stephen S. Foster, and Dennis Washington. On motion, the Convention then took a recess of 30 minutes.

AFTERNOON SESSION.—Discussion of the 2d resolution continued, in which Abby Kelly Foster J. W. Walker, S. S. Foster and B. S. Jones participated.

EVENING SESSION.—S. S. Foster reported resolutions 2d and 3d as adopted, and urged the formation of Societies in every town where two or three could be found willing to meet together and unite their efforts for the overthrow of Slavery. On motion, the Convention adjourned to meet at 10 o'clock the following morning.

SECOND DAY.

Convention opened with singing an Anti-Slavery song. J. W. Walker, in a speech of thrilling interest, demonstrated the Anti-Slavery movement to be the only Christian movement of the day, and consequently claiming the sympathies and co-operation of every Christian. B. S. Jones followed, and in a most conclusive and forcible manner showed up the profligacy of Church and State. S. S. Foster opened the subject of finance, and made a most affecting appeal in behalf of his enslaved brother. Mrs. Foster followed. Her remarks told upon the pockets as well as upon the hearts of the audience.

AFTERNOON SESSION.—The Free Soil party, and the organ of that party, the *Free Democrat*, coming up for consideration, their position was thoroughly discussed by S. S. Foster, Thos. Scott, Mr. Murry, and others.

EVENING SESSION.—B. S. Jones and J. W. Walker argued the superiority of moral and political action, not only in point of principle, but as a matter of expediency. S. S. Foster, in a concluding and powerful speech, demonstrated, from the very "nature of things," the organization of an Anti-Slavery political party must of necessity prove a failure. The Finance Committee collected the sum of $57,75. The resolutions were then taken up separately, and adopted as follows:

1. Resolved, That we reiterate most solemnly the sentiment which from the beginning has been the rallying cry of Abolitionists, that Slavery is a sin against God and the highest crime against man, and shall so declare until this guilty nation repents of its wrongs, and demonstrates its sincerity by undoing the heavy burdens and setting the oppressed free.

2. Resolved, That this Convention deeply feels the necessity of a thorough organization of the Anti-Slavery cause in this State, on the basis of the American Anti-Slavery Society, by which it shall be taken from the arena of politics, and the control of demagogues and political aspirants, and placed in the hands of enlightened philanthropists, who have no object to promote but the highest good of our common country, and are under no temptations to pervert it to party or sectarian purposes.

3. Resolved, That we heartily rejoice in the auspicious commencement of this work in the recent organization of a State Anti-Slavery Society, and sincerely hope it will go on until there shall be an efficient auxiliary association in every county and town in the State, and we here pledge to the State Society our warmest sympathies and cordial co-operation in its holy work of renovating the public sentiment of the community, so that Slavery can find no support, either in the political or the religious history of the country.

4. Resolved, That we have no controversy with Churches, as such, but oppose them only in so far as they sustain Slavery—as Abolitionists it matters not to us whether ecclesiastical organizations be Catholic or Protestant, whether they hold to the doctrine of the Trinity or Unity, whether they practice baptism by immersion or by sprinkling, worship in silence or with hymns of praise and songs of thanksgiving; if they are true to humanity, faithful in advocating the cause of the slave they will meet with no opposition from the Anti-Slavery platform.

5. Resolved, That no church organization can occupy a true Anti-Slavery position, which retains in membership men who are slaveholders, who defend or apologize for the system, who are members of a government that sustains Slavery, or the supporters of a party which sanctions or tolerates it.

6. Resolved, That although there is a difference in the amount of pro-slavery influence exerted by different ecclesiastical organizations, we know of but one religious denomination which we regard as entirely free from Slavery; and it always affords us pleasure to make mention of the Anti-Slavery character and consistent position of the Old School Covenanters.

7. Resolved, That while we recognise in the Free Soil party many sincere and earnest friends of the slave, we cannot regard the party itself as in any sense entitled to our confidence and support, as an Anti-Slavery agency, but on the contrary, we believe it to be not only radically defective in principle, but in policy utterly at variance with the genius of the Anti-Slavery enterprise, and one of the most formidable obstacles to its progress:

1st, Because it diverts the attention of Abolitionists from the all important work of converting the community to Anti-Slavery, to a mere scramble for political place and power.

2d, Because practically it degrades the Anti-Slavery cause in the public estimation from its high moral preeminence, to a level with the political questions of the day, and transforms its advocates from Christian philanthropists into mere political demagogues.

3d, Because it prevents the nomination and consequent election to office by the other parties of candidates friendly to liberty, and thereby greatly retards the reform of our national and State Legislation. And

Whereas, the *Free Democrat*, the accredited organ of the Free Soil party, has wilfully and repeatedly misrepresented the position and doctrines of the agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society now labouring in this State, as well as the position and doctrines of the Michigan Anti-Slavery Society and its agents, endeavouring to produce the impression that the principles they advocate are calculated and designed to sap the foundations of all good, to bring into discredit the doctrine of Christian Democracy, and disseminate throughout our land the seeds of vice and immorality, denying to them and their friends the right of defence through the columns of the paper through which they have been assailed and maligned. Therefore,

Resolved, That the *Free Democrat*, while claiming to be especially a friend of the slave, is doing an eminently pro-slavery work in misrepresenting and defaming some of the truest friends of freedom, that its denial of the right of defence in its columns proves the despotism of its conductors, that its cowardly, partial-policy disqualifies it from being the recognized organ of any party which claims to be the advocate of "free men, free thought, and free speech."

Resolved, That while we do not hold all the members of the Free Soil party responsible for the infamous conduct of their organ, yet when they become acquainted with the facts of the case, we cannot but regard longer continuance of their support as an evidence that they approve, or at least do not disapprove of its course; and they can only demonstrate the contrary by bearing a practical testimony against its present conductors and so reform their organ that it shall become a fair, impartial truthful and decent publication.

A motion that the Secretaries be instructed to forward a copy of the proceedings and resolutions to the *Anti-Slavery Bugle, Voice of the Fugitive* and *Free Democrat*, for publication, was carried.

On motion, the Convention adjourned.

CYRUS FULLER, Pres.

CYNTHIA WALTON,
RICHARD GLASIER, Jr., } *Secretaries.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1854.

THE QUESTION—THE PROSPECT.

THE Nebraska Question is, at this present writing, still before the Senate. Messrs. Toombs of Georgia, Hunter of Virginia, Brown of Mississippi, Brodhead of Pennsylvania, and Cass of Michigan have spoken in favour of the Swindle, and Mr. Cooper of Pennsylvania against it, during the past week. The friends of the measure agreed, in caucus, that Douglas should close the debate and the question be taken on Wednesday. The bill will of course pass by a large majority.

Then will come the struggle in the House. The conspirators will probably attempt to forestall debate by the previous question. In this they may succeed; and if so, the measure may be carried before this number of the *Standard* is in the hands of its readers. If the attempt shall fail, the struggle will doubtless be prolonged for weeks; but that the Slave Power will finally carry its point we have very little doubt. Remonstrances are pouring in from every part of the Free States, and meetings are being held in hundreds of places to denounce the scheme, but they are too late. The slaveholders are united as one man, the whole power of the Administration is on their side, and they will have little difficulty in buying all the Northern support that they need.

The following letters from Washington contain our latest information.

Correspondence of The Evening Post.

WASHINGTON, February 27, 1854.

A careful canvass of the House was completed on Saturday last, by the opponents of the Nebraska bill, and it was found that it could be defeated, with anything like fair play, by a pretty close vote. Your experience will have taught you that this unofficial way of taking the yeas and nays is not always to be relied on; but as far as such statements can be trusted, I think you may depend upon the defeat of the Nebraska bill in the House, either by a square up-and-down vote or else by an oblique movement, which will prove quite as effectual. Bell, of Tennessee, in the Senate, and a good share of the Tennessee delegation, Democrats and Whigs, in the House, it is ascertained, are against the bill. Mr. Bell, it is rumoured, will speak against it. There is also quite a fluttering among the Whig portion of the Kentucky representatives since Mr. Crittenden's opposition to the measure has become known; while some of the most determined opponents of the bill in the House will be among the members from Missouri. Even if the prospects against the bill were less encouraging, the delay which it is now certain must occur would usually be fatal to such a project; each day's mail is fraught with popular sentiment too decided and too universal to be easily misunderstood.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

WASHINGTON, Monday, Feb. 27, 1854.

It is understood there are but three members of the House from New England who will vote for Nebraska. These are Hibbard, of New Hampshire; Ingersoll, of Connecticut; and McDonald, of Maine. It is believed that all the remaining members of the New England Delegation will be faithful to their trust and true to freedom.

Of these three, Hibbard is one of the tail feathers of the President, and of course follows the bird he is attached to. He would make a poor fist at flying alone, and so does not attempt to disengage himself. He does not need to sell out, for he has already given himself away.

Ingersoll, of Connecticut, is a harmless young man, one of those anomalies, a hereditary Democrat born to wealth, and belonging to the class of genteel dilletanti. He was educated and has resided abroad, possesses aristocratic tastes, and believes in Slavery as an aristocratic institution. A genuine Democratic sentiment probably never crept through his hair. There is, however, a possibility he may yet be saved by good advice from home.

McDonald, of Maine, is the last and the smallest of the trio, if precedence between such small persons can be determined. He has enjoyed perfect obscurity during his entire Congressional term, now something over two years, and we understand has no expectation of any future honours in the elective line. By following the Administration lead now, he expects to make so much of a ripple in his Congressional career as to show the spot where he went down. He may be rewarded for his treachery by an Inspector's birth in some one of the numerous Custom-Houses in Maine.

COLONIZATION—DISCUSSION.

AT Norristown, Pa., on the evenings of Feb. 15th and 16th, a discussion of the merits of the scheme of African Colonization took place between J. Morris Pease, Secretary of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, and Rev. Samuel Aaron, one of the soundest Abolitionists, as well as one of the most eloquent public speakers to whom we have have ever listened. Mr. Pease visited Norristown in his official capacity to win support for the Society of which he is an agent, and having avowed his readiness to discuss the question of Colonization with any one who might be willing to meet him, Mr. Aaron took up the gauntlet. Each of the disputants selected a moderator, and the two selected a third. The audience were admitted at 12 1-2 cents per head, and such was the interest in the subject that the large hall was filled from first to last. The first evening the speakers were limited to half an house each at a time; the second evening to twenty minutes; and on the last occasion each disputant spoke four times.

Two accounts of the discussion are before us—one that of the Norristown *Herald and Free Press*, the other that of the *Olive Branch*. From these two sources we compile the following statement.

Mr. Pease, in his lectures, had made many statements which Mr. Aaron attempted to refute. For instance, Mr. Pease asserted that Lieut. Forbes, of the British Navy, had been discharged from service, because he declared that Slavery existed in Liberia, some years ago. Mr. Aaron proved that said officer was never cashiered, and still continued in the British Navy. Mr. Pease had asserted that the genius of Colonization had emancipated *eight hundred thousand slaves* in thirty-five years. Mr. Aaron proved—as every school boy might know—that the number of slaves emancipated in that period of time, by all the influences put together, have not exceeded fifty thousand—only fourteen hundred having been emancipated during the past year. Mr. Aaron's comments on these *two* statements, Mr. Pease did not notice at all—he did not attempt an explanation, and passed them by in silence.

Mr. Aaron endeavoured to show that Colonization was founded on prejudice against colour. To prove this, he called upon Bishop Payne, of the African Methodist Church, to testify that Mr. Durbin, an eminent Colonizationist, had told him (Bishop Payne) so in conversation some time ago. Mr. Pease had the meanness to call in question the Bishop's testimony, and demanded his credentials, which he received the next night. Mr. Aaron called up Mrs. Mason, the wife of a Presbyterian Missionary in Liberia, who returned from that country six months ago, on account of her health. She stated that the climate was exceedingly unhealthy, and that the emigrants suffered greatly from disease; that it was a particularly unfavourable country for the poor—wages low and employment scarce, as the Colonists have their work done by enslaved natives—and that the poor suffer for want of all the necessaries of life; that no effort is made to instruct the natives, and that they are not admitted in church; that servitude there is as bad as American Slavery—that natives are bought and sold, and beaten as here; that it was next to impossible for the poor to get away from there, as they could not raise the means to pay their passage—she knew great numbers of emigrants who wanted to come back, but they could not get away; that letters were intercepted at the Post Office and examined, and if unfavourable to the Colony, they would not be sent; that President Roberts, and other dignitaries travelled on the backs of the natives, as we do on horse-back (the last statement of Mrs. M., Mr. Pease acknowledged as true), and many things of the same sort.

Mrs. Gantts, another coloured lady recently returned from Africa, testified to the same things. Mr. Pease again had the meanness to impugn the statements of those women, though he had never been there himself. He was ready to brand everybody as a liar who would not corroborate his own "facts," though many of them had previously been proved false. He read a long list of Reverends, Right Reverends, Generals, Colonels, Honourables, &c., &c., as members of different Colonization Societies, to prove that it is a good thing (the same list of dignitaries might be read to prove that Slavery and the Rum traffic are good things). He read long and prosy letters from interested parties in Africa, published in his own paper; lauding Liberia as a paradise.

On the 2d evening, those women brought letters proving they sustained unimpeachable characters, and were prominent members of Churches in Philadelphia—their own pastor being present to testify to their merit.

Mr. Aaron called Mr. John D. Phares, of Norristown, who spent several years on the coast of Africa, and who corroborated all the ladies had said—excepting the interception of letters—of that he had no knowledge. He affirmed most explicitly, that the state of things in Liberia, was *as bad as Slavery*, though the system did not exist there in legal form.

The last speech of Mr. Aaron, was a magnificent effort. He urged the people to remember that this array of living witnesses were more reliable and trustworthy than the letters of the interested men of the Society—that the Colonization scheme was the truckling tool of the Slave Power—that it was originated and controlled by slaveholders for their peculiar interests. He read from Mr. Pease's own letter to an Alabama Planter, assuring him that Colonization should not interfere with the Slave system in the remotest degree. He depicted the injustice and cruelty of the scheme, and the duplicity of some of its prominent votaries, with thrilling eloquence and power. In sober truth, every statement and argument advanced by Mr. P. was promptly met, and most triumphantly refuted.

THE SPEECH OF A VETERAN.

NOT many days ago, a meeting, composed for the most part of "the solid men of Boston," the admirers and followers of Daniel Webster, was held in the Old Cradle of Liberty, to protest against the proposed repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Among those who participated in the proceedings were Hon. Abbot Lawrence, J. Thomas Stevenson, George S. Hillard, Rev. Dr. Blagden and others. Among the aged men who countenanced the meeting by their presence was the Hon. JOSIAH QUINCY, formerly member of Congress from Boston, afterwards Mayor, and, still later, President of Harvard College. For many years he has taken no public part in political affairs, and he was too honest as well as too sagacious a friend of freedom to allow himself to be swept from his moorings by the flood which engulphed so many of his fellow-citizens in 1850. The people assembled on this occasion in Faneuil Hall, seeing him in their midst, could not restrain their pleasure nor forbear to call upon him for a speech. On every side went up a cry for "Quincy!" "Quincy!" to which, according to newspaper reports, he responded as follows:

"What right have you to call upon a man eighty-three years old to address you? Sir, I Belong to other times. (A voice in the crowd said, 'No, the ears of the fathers are never deaf to the cries of the children.') I came here this evening, not only unasked, but with a determination not to speak; and, Sir, what I shall say will be very short, and it will run in a different strain from anything you have heard. I suppose that you expect me to say something about the enormity of this attempt to repeal the Missouri Compromise. Not a word, Sir (laughter). I shall leave that to younger and abler men—to men who are in the current of the times. I have been out of it for thirty years. Perhaps you expect also I should say something severe upon the politicians—the leaders of the slaveholding States. Sir, I have nothing to say against them. Many of them are great men—they are true men—they are faithful men—true to their own interests; faithful to their own power. And, Sir, they understand this to be the last act in that policy which has been in operation since the year 1882, and indeed from the commencement of the Government (cheers). There were two projects from the beginning. The first was to secure to the slaveholding States the power of controlling the Government at all times; and have they not done it? (Cries of "Yes," "Yes.") Have you had but one President in effect, chosen by the people, that was from the free States? The next plan of the policy was to extend the power of the slaveholding States, and for that purpose they bought Louisiana, and for that purpose they made war upon Mexico. And, Sir, what has been their success? They have opened, or if this law passes, they will have opened all the lands of the South that are capable of holding slaves, to the extension of their power. They have opened to themselves a market, and they understand their advantages. What is the consequence of opening this market? A gentleman recently from the South told me that slaves were in such demand, in consequence of the opening of this country, that he knew of one family of some ten or twelve negroes—men, women and children—some of the latter at the breast—and they sold for $800 a head, down to the very child at the woman's breast. A good active slave is worth at this time $1,800. This is the effect of their system of extension. Now the question is, how did they get this power? I said they were true and faithful to their own interests. I wish I could say the same thing, Sir, of the political men of the free States (cheers). Sir, it is not their strength, but our weakness; it is not their union, it is our disunion. And, Sir, they govern the people of the North by the distribution of the funds from the Treasury. They have governed it, and they will continue to govern it, until the people themselves shall understand what the motives of their leaders are, and put them down by force. Gentlemen, I said that this was not a new thing. In the year 1807-8, I was a Representative from this district in the Congress of the United States, and had a frequent and close intimacy and great opportunities for acquaintance with the Southern views and opinions, through the medium of a gentleman who was the best Representative on the floor of Congress of Southern feelings and Southern principles. I mean John Randolph. At that time it was the question concerning the embargo. Well, Sir, who voted for the embargo? Who supported it in this part of the country? I am sorry to mention it, for I have a great love for the Democracy of the country; no man more so. I hold that I am a Democrat, myself, and always have been. But no man could speak with more contempt than Mr. Randolph did of the leaders of the Democracy, who were defending the embargo. I remember that he said to me once, in relation to a Northern Member from the neighbouring town of Salem, who had made a great speech in fav

MICHIGAN.—In another column will be found the proceedings of an Anti-Slavery Convention lately held at Livonia, Wayne Co., Michigan. Those faithful friends of the cause, S. S. and A. K. Foster, have been labouring in that State for several months past with excellent effect. J. W. Walker, whose ability and experience qualify him for efficient service, has also spent considerable time in the State, and Benjamin S. Jones, another faithful lecturer, is now at work there, having been sent within the last few weeks by the Western Anti-Slavery Society. The leaders of the Free Democracy, and their organ, the Michigan *Free Democrat*, instead of welcoming to the State these faithful champions of the cause, and differing from them, when they were compelled to differ at all, in a *fraternal spirit*, have treated them as foes, denounced them as infidels, closed meeting-houses and halls against them, and, in short, done all in their power to drive them from the State. Many of the rank-and-file of the party, however, have treated them with kindness, and we have reason to believe that their labours are producing highly valuable results. They are organizing the radical and clear-sighted friends of the cause upon the catholic platform of the American Society, and preparing the way for a moral and religious movement far more potent than any political or party arrangement, however pure its elements.

—We learn from a letter, written by J. W. Walker to the *Bugle*, that the Fosters had a narrow escape from death recently in a railroad accident near Ann Arbor. It appears that just as the cars were nearing the station, passing round a very short curve, the engine ran off the track, pitching headlong down a steep bank, rolling over and over, stopping bottom uppermost. The tender was upset on the edge of the bank, while the baggage and emigrant cars were thrown athwart the track. The passenger cars remained on the track, and, although the confusion was very great, none of the passengers were injured.

EDWARD EVERETT.—Those who have read Mr. Everett's speech on the Nebraska Question, if their souls are not utterly petrified, must acknowledge the justice of the following remarks from the *Evening Post*:

Look at that polished icicle, Edward Everett—the man who, when in the pulpit, was said to have offered up the most eloquent prayer ever addressed to a Boston congregation—look at that finished statue, hear him express his high "admiration" (that is the word he uses) for the Compromise measures of 1850—the damnable Fugitive Slave law not excepted—and if you doubt any longer that his lips are made of marble, because you see them move, you will not doubt that his heart is made of stone. Educated, learned, accomplished, elegant, what a pity that, while God gave him ten talents, the Devil—who always puts in weak ones—should have supplied his back bone. The freedom of a great territory, the highest right—the right of liberty—of millions yet to be—the cause committed to his hands is no less than this. And yet, with what an effeminate and soft and flattering voice he pleads a case worthy of a giant's struggle! How carefully he treads among the toes of the Southern Senators, by the very gentleness of his opposition tenderly wooing future Southern support for the Presidency! How, while he argues this great case, does he at the same time concede the main point to his opponents, by falsely admitting that the great question is of no practical importance! Ah, yes! how blandly he smiles away the liberty of the unborn generations of men and women, who shall toil and bleed under the lash when he shall be sleeping—if their groans will let him sleep—in his grave! And yet this is the same man who, a few years ago, when a candidate for Governor of Massachusetts, wrote a letter avowing himself in favour of immediate emancipation. No backbone has he.

EMANCIPATION FROM PARTY.—The *Osaukee* (Wis.) *Times*, a Democratic paper, heretofore a supporter of the Administration, has spoken out in manly tones against the Nebraska Iniquity. It bids defiance, in the following terms, to the attempt to make the support of the measure a test of Democratic orthodoxy:

It is said that the Nebraska bill has been adopted as an Administration measure, and that it will be made the standard by which to test the Democracy—all appointments to be made by it. We proceed to state in advance, that it cannot be made the test of Democratic principles—they are beyond the reach of the infamous thing—but it can be made the test of "Pierce Democrats," and when it is, *we are not one of them*. We cannot belong to a party that makes Slavery its Shibboleth. We cannot believe that the Democratic party will submit to such a humiliation. We believe that at the next Presidential election, if not before, it will assert its freedom from Presidential dictation. But if our hopes are to end in disappointment—if the Democratic party accept this new test, and if it puts upon the Presidential course in 1856 any one of the men instrumental in setting it up, we must part its company. No man can receive our support, however feeble it is, for the Chief Magistracy, who sustains this infamous outrage upon Freedom and Free Territory.

The editor who talks thus is certainly not among those who have sold their birthright as a *quid pro quo* for a postmaster's birth, or for any other mess of executive pottage. May the number of such rebels against party dictation and fraud be multiplied!

A CALL TO DEMOCRATIC LEADERS.—The *Evening Post*, we are glad to perceive, is daily pouring its heaviest broadsides into the camp of the slaveholders and their allies, the doughfaces. It calls upon the leaders of that wing of the Democratic party to which it belongs to lift up their voices at this crisis in behalf of freedom and in rebuke of political perfidy.

There is a North, but it wants more voices. And we wish, more particularly, to inquire if there has been any weakening of the spine among the Democratic leaders—not in Congress, but out of Congress—or if they are troubled by bronchitis, or loss of voice, that more of them are not heard from.

Preston King—always true as steel, and wise—has written a letter which will tell for freedom wherever it is read. But where is the people's favourite, John Van Buren? He has called out a letter, it is true, from ex-Senator Jere Clemens, on the right side; but the popular ear listens expectant for his voice. Will he let the mighty occasion pass by in silence? It is idle for him to say that he is not in public life. Whether holding office or not, such men are, in one sense, always in public life. In critical times the people look to them for words of counsel, and encouragement, and for a strong and faithful expression of the public sentiment. If Mr. Van Buren does not stir himself, he will find his rival, Gov. Seward, who, loaded with political heresies on other questions, is buoyed up and borne aloft by his fidelity on this, ahead of him in the general estimation.

A correspondent makes the inquiry—Where is General Dix? Yes, where is General Dix, whose physical courage would not quail at the cannon's mouth—has he no bold word for freedom now?

Stiffer backbones are wanted; not amongst the people, but amongst the politicians.

VOICES FROM THE PULPIT.—It affords us pleasure to state that several clergymen in this city and vicinity have spoken out nobly against the Nebraska Perfidy. Rev. Joseph P. Thompson, of the Tabernacle Church, preached an excellent sermon on the subject several weeks ago, which was subsequently published. We have delayed noticing it in the hope of finding room for extracts. Rev. Henry Ward Beecher has spoken in his own pulpit no less boldly than elsewhere, and Rev. Geo. B. Cheever, D. D., the walls of whose church are not accustomed to resound with denunciations of Slavery, has uttered his protest against the perfidious project for setting aside the Missouri compact.

On Sunday morning last it was our privilege to listen to a faithful and stirring discourse from the lips of Rev. D. M. Graham, Pastor of the Freewill Baptist Church in Sullivan street. He spoke, in terms befitting a Christian teacher, of the whole subject of Slavery and its connection with the ecclesiastical bodies and benevolent societies in the country, and maintained that it was the solemn duty of every minister of the Gospel to cry aloud against a system which debases the image of God and exposes the land to the Divine judgments. Want of room compels us to omit a sketch of this discourse.

It is probable that others of the clergymen of New York have spoken with equal fidelity upon this subject, but the great majority of them are dumb as their hearers are dead!

POLITICAL BARGAINING.—It is a singular fact that, notwithstanding the large majority given by Pennsylvania for Pierce, in 1852, and the great number of hungry applicants in that State for federal patronage, the lucrative office of U. S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania is still filled by J. W. Ashmun, Whig, the man who was the tool of Webster and Fillmore in the infamous attempt to convict as traitors more than thirty citizens of Pennsylvania, who were charged with aiding or abetting the escape of certain fugitive slaves at Christiana. The Washington correspondent of the *Herald* states that the Democracy of Pennsylvania have tried in vain to effect his removal, and that his political friends in Washington defy and dare the Administration to touch him, both they and he unreservedly asserting that he is retained in compliance with the provisons of a bargain solemnly entered into between them and Pierce, in 1852!

THE VOICE OF MASSACHUSETTS.—The following resolutions, protesting against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, have been adopted by both branches of the Massachusetts Legislature. In the Senate, they passed unanimously, and in the House of Representatives the vote stood, on the question of sending them to a third reading, yeas 246, nays 13:

1. Resolved, That we view with apprehension and alarm the proposition now pending before the Congress of the United States, to repeal a solemn injunction against the introduction of Slavery into a territory now free, and which was sacredly appropriated to the exclusive occupation of freemen by the compromise of 1820.

2. Resolved, That we can hold it as nothing less than a violation of plighted faith to annul all that part of the Missouri Compromise which remains to be falfilled for the benefit of Freedom and the free States, while all that part which was intended for the benefit of Slavery and the slave States is rigidly insisted upon, and has been fully executed.

3. Resolved, That in behalf of the people of Massachusetts, we deplore the introduction of this measure, as a proposition calculated to disturb that which has been already settled; and that if we are to witness fresh scenes of sectional animosity and contention, the authors and supporters of the Nebraska bill must forever bear the responsibility, and be answerable for all the fearful consequences of so flagrant an act of injustice.

5. Resolved, That his Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit a copy of these resolutions to each of the Senators and Representatives of Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States.

DAILY NATIONAL ERA.—Our thanks are due to Dr. Bailey for sending to the *Standard* of late the *Daily* instead of the *Weekly National Era*. The differences of opinion between the Doctor and the Radical Abolitionists do not blind us to the value of his labours in unmasking the designs of the Slave Power at the seat of the Government. Notwithstanding our conviction that he and his school are to some extent "dauding with untempered mortar," we have no doubt that, according their own best judgment, they are wisely adapting their means to secure the great end which all sincere friends of liberty have in view. So far as we agree with them—and certainly we *do* agree with them in many things of the highest importance—we will bid them God-speed; and, when we are compelled to dissent from anything that they say or do, we will not forget that they and we are brethren labouring in a common cause. At the present time the *Era* is doing good service by its prompt and faithful exposure of the sophistries by which Senator Douglas and his confederates are seeking to blind the North to their corrupt designs. It is only fair, moreover, to say, that Dr. Bailey takes no part in the efforts of false-hearted sectarians to brand the Old School Abolitionists as infidels.

WENDELL PHILLIPS gave the Twelfth Lecture in the New York Anti-Slavery Society's Course, at the Tabernacle, on Tuesday evening. The audience was larger than at any previous lecture, filling every seat and standing-place from which it was possible to see and hear the speaker. Mr. Phillips sustained his reputation as one of the most accomplished of living orators, while he boldly avowed and defended with masterly ability the very doctrines which in past times were so odious in the public estimation that the utterance of them in this Slavery-ridden city was almost certain to provoke a riot. He was heard not only with attention but with sympathy by hundreds who had either never heard him before, or heard only to denounce and repudiate his teachings. If all the previous lectures had been so many failures, this one would have made the course a triumph. We shall publish a full report next week.

—The concluding lecture of the course will be given on Tuesday evening next (March 7th, the Anniversary of Webster's treachery), by RALPH WALKO EMERSON.

HOUSEHOLD WORDS.—The American Edition of this work for *March*, embracing four weekly issues (Numbers 197, 198, 199, 200), is on our table. The contents are as follows:

The Long Voyage; Iron Insidents; Greek Easter at Constantinople; A Defence of Fleas; A New Year's Eve; Down Among the Dead Men; Voices from the Deep; Tucked Up; The Horse Guard Rampant; Amy, the Child; On Her Majesty's Service; A Leaf from the Parish Register; The Steam Whistle in India; Off! Off! The Bells; Many Hunters; The Stop the Way Company; Seasonable Gains; Case of Real Distress; The Sack of Chestnuts; Slates; One Spot of Green; Completely Registered; Regular Trappers; The Antecedents of Australia; Ignoble Conduct of a Nobleman; Fire and Snow; Lives of Plants; Pharisees and Sinners; The Goblins of the Marsh—A Masque; Half-a-Dozen Leeches; A Border of the Black Sea; School Keeping.

Not less than four of the articles above enumerated are from the pen of Dickens, while all the others passed under his critical eye before publication.—McElrath and Barker, publishers, 17 Spruce street. Terms: monthly numbers 20 cts.; by mail, $2 a year.

GOLD PEN.—Our thanks are due to our Buckeye-Yankee friend, SAMUEL BROOKE, for a fine Gold Pen, with a beautiful silver handle, which he put into our hands, a few days since, not merely as a token of personal friendship, but that it might be employed in the defence of a cause to which he has devoted so many years of his life. Radical Anti-Slavery in Ohio owes much to his sagacity, enterprise and pertinacious zeal. At present he is engaged in an extensive mercantile business at Cleveland, but the interests and cares of trade can never make him forgetful of his duties to humanity. The ledger, does not, with him, take the place of the Decalogue and the Golden Rule. We promise him that his gift shall not be prostituted to the service of Slavery, or employed in giving expression to any sentiment which, "dying, he could wish to blot."

THE *Wesleyan* newspaper, in its treatment of those from whom it differs in theological matters, exhibits a measure of fairness quite unusual among religious disputants. Recently Rev. S. J. May (Unitarian) preached several discourses upon the Trinity in his own pulpit. The editor of the *Wesleyan* attended in person and reported the sermons with entire fairness, reserving all comments thereon until he had given his patrons an opportunity to read and consider Mr. May's opinions. We love to record such evidences that men whose creeds differ very widely are not necessarily foes to each other. It makes us think better of human nature, and inspires the hope that the good time is really "coming right along."

"*Republican Free Press*" is the title of a new paper which has just reached us from Woodstock, McHenry Co., Ill. It is intended to meet the wants of those who have become tired of the slavery of party as well as of the Slavery of the plantation. "Liberty and Temperance" are among the objects to which it will be devoted. The editor is J. Dwight. We hope he may be successful in his new enterprise.

BAZAAR REPORT.—The Twentieth Report of the National Anti-Slavery Bazaar, which appeared in the *Standard* of Jan. 21st, has been republished in pamphlet form. Presenting, as it does, a clear statement of Anti-Slavery principles and measures as held and practically exemplified by the American Anti-Slavery Society, we hope it may be widely circulated both at home and abroad, and thus be the means of winning new and efficient support to the cause.

MRS. STOWE'S NEW WORK.—Phillips, Samson & Co., of Boston, announce the publication, in May, of another work from the pen of Harriet Beecher Stowe. It will be entitled, "Sunny Memoirs of Foreign Lands," and will appear in two volumes, illustrated with designs from Billings.

REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER is advertised to lecture in Concert Hall, Philadelphia, on Thursday evening next. His subject is not mentioned.

DOMESTIC CORRESPONDENCE.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CXLI.

THE ARGUMENT.—*The Correspondent Superior to the Weather—He is Classical and Original—The Microscopic Giant—Whig perplexities—In the General Court—And in Boston—The Anonymous Call—Who Came—Who Presided—Who Spoke—The Correspondent's opinion of the Meeting in Faneuil Hall, &c., &c., &c.*

BOSTON, Feb., 28, 1854.

THE last day of Winter, as I live! That is to say, if it be not Leap Year, which I believe it is not. The weather has mitigated itself a good deal since I complained of its behaviour in my last. Indeed, it was so warm for a number of successive days that it seemed as if it were true, as somebody once said of a February long since expired (it was Cowper I believe, in one of his letters), that January being dead, who Chaucer tells us was the husband of May, "February had married the widow." However, I am not reduced to the weather for my topics this week. "*Paulo majora canamus!*" Let us sing of slightly bigger things.

It was very disobliging of that little giant (a very minute one, I should judge) to pitch that Nebraska Apple (the illustration is not, perhaps, strictly new; but it must answer), into the midst of our Olympus at Washington, and to set all those divine creatures a-scrambling. It would not have been so bad, however, had the commotion been confined to those "Sainted Seats." But it has extended all over the country and disturbed the peace of the remotest districts. Even here, for example, just as the Whigs had got comfortably into the saddle, having used the Free Soil Convention as a horse-block, comes cranking in this plaguy question, as if on purpose to play into their antagonists' hands and to put Capital into their political Bank. They were quite puzzled for some time to know what to do about it in Great and General Court. Resolutions condemning this little impropriety were introduced; but a just and prudent apprehension that they might strengthen the hands of Free Soil, gave the Whigs pause, and there was a time when it seemed likely that the State would hold its tongue on the subject altogether. But then, on the other hand, not to say anything about it, might be used by those pestilent fellows that delight in turning the world up-side down on pretence of getting it right-side up, as an occasion of offence against the true Anti-Slavery party. So, at last, the Resolutions were passed unanimously by the Senate (composed only of Whigs and Free Soilers), and with only a dozen, or so, negatives from Adamantine Democrats, in the House.

So, again, in this City, the Free Soilers who held a Convention in Faneuil Hall some fortnight since, offered to give up the Hall and the Organization of the Meeting to the Whigs, as the more numerous party, if they would take it up. But they declined the operation, lest peradventure their good manners might be corrupted by their evil communications. So the Free Soilers had to go ahead in their own name and on their own account. And it really seemed as if Boston, which rocked as if it were the cradle of a young Earthquake, in 1820, in view of the infant rascality of Missouri, were going to disturb the nation only by its snoring over the full-grown villany of Nebraska. You know it would not do to give any handle to those wretched Abolitionists and Free Soilers But at last an anonymous Call was issued summoning the Citizens without distinction of party to assemble in Faneuil Hall, on Thursday last, to say their say about it. One would have supposed that the newspapers would have poured themselves in as vouchers of such a document, as was the case when Mr. Webster saved the Union (but not his own nomination!) on the 7th of March, 1850. This modest Call, however, came forth without a single sponsor to bestow upon it his name, and to become responsible for its good behaviour. By and bye, however, it was whispered in secret places that it was a Movement of the Webster Whigs (if, indeed, the men who deserted the Whig party, at its utmost need, deserve the name of Whigs), and that it was not promoted by the leading men of the Whig party in Boston. You need not be told that less than such an intimation would have been enough to secure the attendance of your indefatigable Correspondent, at the scene of action.

The Meeting was held at 4 o'clock, P. M., and the afternoon was a stormy one; but, still, the Hall was well filled, indeed, crowded at its fullest moment. It had been announced that the Chair would be taken by the Hon. Samuel A. Eliot, the Member for Boston, who voted for the Compromises, and who has never been forgiven, even by his own wing of the Whig party, for the false (or at least awkward) position he had put them into. When this gentleman appeared at the head of the procession of officers, treading its way through the crowd, no cheer was heard and no man said God bless him! The Meeting was organized by appointing an immense number of obscure persons as Vice-Presidents, very few of whom seemed to be known by sight or name to the oldest inhabitants present. Of course, Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Winthrop must be excepted from this category, who had been induced to attend the Meeting but who had the grace to appear not over-proud of their company. Several things were noticeable about this Meeting. The Chairman was a Webster Whig; all the Speakers that were pre-ordained were Webster Whigs; and the Resolutions were quite as much, to say the least, an endorsement of Webster Whiggism, as a remonstrance against Slavery in Nebraska. Nevertheless, it *was*, an entertaining sight to see these gentlemen dancing about on the platform and protesting against the logical consequence of the premises they had hailed three years ago as a new Revelation from Heaven.

When Mr. Eliot made his speech on taking the Chair, he was listened to with the coldest civility, and his allusion to his own vote for the Compromise of 1850, excited only an emphatic silence. The Resolutions, in effect expostulated with the Slaveholders for their unkindness, when we had laid ourselves at their feet in 1850, in proposing to put their feet on our necks in 1854. They recounted (by allusion) the glories and triumphs of the Sims Campaign, and complained that those laurels should now be turned to cypress. Not only had the Slaveholders refused to give Mr Webster so much as a single vote as a candidate for the Presidency, and then made him get up and thank 'em for it in his shirt, but now they insist upon breaking our noses and spitting in our faces by way of epilogue.

"Perhaps it is right to dissemble their love;
But why will they kick us down stairs!"

These are not the precise words of the Resolution; but this was their sum and substance. They had the effect of an attempt to get Webster Wiggism endorsed by a Meeting nominally of men of all parties. I do not say that this was the deliberate purpose of the getters-up of the Meeting; but to the profane vulgar on the outside, they had an awful squint in that direction. It was very obvious, however, from the tone and temper of the assembly, that it was far in advance of the fuglemen. And had any prominent Scott Whig moved a substitute, omitting all allusion to the Compromise of 1850 and to the Kidnapping of Sims, and bringing 1820 face to face with 1850, Missouri with Nebraska, it would have been adopted by acclamation.

This was evident from several circumstances. For instance, it was with great difficulty that even an appearance of enthusiasm could be extorted for the name of Mr. Webster. Mr. J. T. Stevenson, a very respectable gentleman, whom the Whigs have been obliged, in the dearth of Speakers occasioned by the Free Soil Apostacy, to set up as an orator, on a very moderate capital, made the attempt first. He made an allusion to the great man, but finding that it was falling flat ("flounders are not flatter") on the audience, he with some adroitness changed his front by saying that in this place that name were more fitly honoured by *silence!* or words to that effect. And it was highly honoured in that way. Indeed, it took all the rhetorical power of Mr. Hillard, putting on a forty-Choate power of clap-trap, to couple even a moderate round of applause with the name of the Great Disappointed. And it was all through the strongest Anti-Slavery sentiments that brought down the House the most emphatically. As when Mr. Hillard said that the slaveholders held their Slaves by precisely the same tenure that the Turk marries his four wives and the Hindoos burn their widows. These things, gentlemen of those persuasions emigrating to this country, may not do at present. But I would say for their encouragement, that as soon as we have annexed them and made a compact with them, we will "with alacrity" catch their runaway wives for the one and thrust back on the pile the reluctant widows of the other. And all divines of any eminence will say that Christian duty demands it.

And when the Rev. Dr. Blagden boldly declared that he thought Slavery was not a sin in itself but was authorized by the Old and New Testaments, he was encountered by a very general cry of Shame! Shame! from all parts of the Hall, which, of course, could not have come from believers in the Gospel of the Compromises, but rather from infidel upholders of the heresy of the Higher Law. And when Mr. Winthrop was forced to mount the platform, his reminder that he voted *against* the Compromise Measures, and his statement that he did not altogether agree with the Resolutions before the Meeting, were received with a perfect storm of applause. The Hon. Josiah Quincy, Senior, too, who headed the Call for the Meeting to protest against the Fugitive Slave Bill, being incidentally present and spied out by the audience, was called upon in a way which compelled him to come forward. His reception was enthusiastically warm, and the points of his speech in which he rebuked the servility of Northern politicians, and told of the contempt the slaveholders had for them, and the Union of Northern men for Northern, rights which was the only, and the effectual, remedy, were most loudly and warmly cheered; from all which I infer that the meeting was in reality a much better one than it will have credit for, and that its promoters "builded better than they knew."—D. Y.

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

From our Dublin Correspondent.

DUBLIN, February 3, 1854.

MY DEAR GAY: How are you? It is ever so long since I heard from you Parker Pillsbury is writing to Boston, and I may as well send you a line. I have just been reading John Mitchel's suicidal letter to James Haughton, in the New York *Citizen*, copied in the *Standard*. My friend Haughton will be greatly surprised, for he has no sympathy with the doctrine of innate depravity, and is strangely pertinacious in thinking well of those in whom he has once placed confidence. It will surprise him exceedingly to find that John Mitchel, the most redoubtable of all the terrible men who wielded their tongues or their pens against England, in Ireland, six or seven years ago, should have declared himself so plainly a false-hearted lover of the liberty he lauded so much. He has evinced a strange readiness in throwing his own reputation in the mire and rolling it in the mud. It must be said for Davis, Mitchel, Meagher, Dillon, O'Gorman, and the rest of them, that they never gave Mr. Haughton reason to think much of their honesty or consistency as impartial lovers of liberty, or to suppose that they aimed any higher than that patriotism which labours to get everything possible for oneself, not caring a pinch of snuff for the rights, liberties or feelings of others. They probably never could see why they should pretend to greater virtue than the famous old Greek slaveholding patriots two thousand years since, or the Calhouns and MacDuffies of to-day, who frankly declare Slavery to be the corner-stone of your republican edifice. In my opinion, there is no better touch-stone for trying a man's true character than that of Anti-Slavery. It has shown the hollowness and the time-serving character of Kossuth. It shows the coarse recklessness, the utter want of principle of vitriol-throwing Mitchel.

Mr. Mitchel calls James Haughton a worthy and sincere man, but an amiable monomaniac, and informs us that this same worthy man, in his thirst for money, stored up corn, during the Irish famine, till it rotted, and then threw it into the Liffey. This very same story was lately revived by a Dublin whiskey dealer, in his rage against Mr. Haughton as an advocate of temperance—just as it has been almost simultaneously started by the great martyr Mitchel, in his wrath at the same man's onset upon American Slavery. A worthy pair of brothers, these. Nobody in Dublin whose opinion is worthy anything believes this calumny. It is probable enough that James Haughton imported corn into Ireland during that terrible time, and that some of it was bad, and may have been thrown out as unfit for food. It may have been so; but that such a thing ever happened under the circumstances upon which such a hateful construction was placed by Mr. Mitchel and the Dublin publican, no honest man believes.

Mr. Mitchel sneers and has always sneered at political economy, and is horrified that the ports were not closed in Ireland at that time. If America and England, and the rest of Europe, had closed their ports at the same time, what would have become of the Irish people? If it had not been for merchants like Mr. Haughton, who invested their capital in corn, and sent for it to all parts of the world, the sufferings of the Irish poor would have been increased a thousand fold. To my own personal knowledge, the parts of Ireland where the famine raged the fiercest were the very parts to which, from want of roads or good harbours, they had not ready access. The difficulty was not so much in the deficiency of food as in the impossibility of gaining access to the miserable people who had always heretofore relied on the potato. I never heard much of the Young Irelanders as aiding the sufferers at that time, though they did much to keep the country in hot water, and never proposed any feasible plan for her sufferings. If you remember the letter I wrote you at that time, I think you will admit that my impressions of these men have been amply confirmed by the events, and you may be quite sure that no good end or work will be assisted by the addition of such unprincipled demagogues to your population. They will bluster and declaim, and attempt nothing for any good cause by which their own bread and butter will be at all endangered.

Parker Pillsbury is here, and we enjoy his company exceedingly. He is all we were led to expect of him and more. I hope, by rest and recreation, his valuable health will be restored. A physician tells me his is a particularly well constituted frame, and that he sees no reason to apprehend that he may not become as strong and as healthy as ever.

Yours truly, RICHARD D. WEBB.

WILLIAM DONALDSON

PAU (Basse Pyrénees), France, Jan. 25, 1854.

DEAR MR. GAY: Wm. Donaldson, late of Cincinnati, Ohio, widely known as an upright merchant and a good man in every relation of life, died on the 13th inst., at Bagnères de Bigores, South of France, where he had resided, with his family, for a considerable time, on account of his health.

Having learned, only a few weeks since, that they were so near us, and that he was very ill, I rode over there, last week, to see him; but *he was not there—he was risen!*—leaving an affectionate wife and three children to sorrow for his departure, while consoled by the memory of his many endearing excellencies of character, which, even in a land of strangers, had won him many friends.

An unusually large number of the most worthy citizens of the place attended the funeral, as word had gone forth that a good man had died, and they spontaneously gathered to testify their respect for his virtues, to which they were not blinded by the wide difference between his religious faith and theirs (hearly the whole population being Roman Catholic).

The minister of the small Protestant congregation at Bagnères, Mr. Frossard, performed the general services, and I send you a translation of a brief abstract of his discourse, which he has kindly furnished, believing that Mr. Donaldson's many friends in America will be gratified to know something of the circumstances of his departure; and, as he was a constant reader of your paper, you will by publishing it confer a favour on many of them, as well as on

Truly and respectfully yours, M. S.

MR. FROSSARD'S DISCOURSE.

"*After death the judgment.*"

Such is the will of God. We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, to answer for all we may have done, whether good or evil.

"After death the judgment." This idea is also true as regards the human race. When one of our brethren leaves us, we are inclined to examine attentively *what he thought and what he did*.

Jesus Christ says, "Judge not, that ye be not judged, for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged." But if, contrary to this charitable and prudent advice, we yield to the natural impulse, he gives us a rule from which it would be most dangerous to deviate, viz., "Ye shall know them by their fruits." This is a wise rule; and when we look back on our departed brethren, we should not say to ourselves, "What did he say? or what were his peculiar views?" but "What were his acts?"

We will now apply this rule to him whose remains we are now about to deposit in the grave. We have not known him long, yet long enough to appreciate some of his high moral qualities. It appears to us that they may be summed up in a word which he repeated more than once on his death-bed—"*Resignation, Resignation.*"

Our friend had settled himself near the banks of the Ohio; he had built there an elegant mansion, under the shade of a remnant of the ancient forest of the land. He had hoped to see his children grow up there, but God had decided otherwise. *He* had already planted in him the germ of the disease under which he has sunk. Submissive and humble, our friend quitted, without murmuring, his little terrestrial paradise. "Resignation, Resignation."

Our dear friend had one passion, that of *doing good*. Endowed by nature with great habitual calmness, his spirit became excited when he reflected on the holy activity of such persons as William Allen, Elizabeth Fry, and William Wilberforce. Often have I seen his eyes sparkle with indignation when speaking of the iniquity of the Slave Trade and of Slavery. He hoped for the emancipation of the world through education and the influence of the Gospel. How willingly would he have consecrated his life to the active prosecution of such a cause! But God had decided otherwise; He called on him "not to act, but *to suffer*," and our friend humbly submttted to His will. "Resignation, Resignation."

All things in this world must finish. The Lord has recalled his servant, and in doing so has separated him from a beloved wife and children. Our dear friend quitted them without a murmur, without fear—gentle in death, as he had been in the hour of trial and of suffering.

Our friend had undergone another trial, that of leaving forever America, the country of his choice, that industrious and enterprising people, who are sincerely religious, because they are really free. He had to leave it. "Resignation, Resignation."

"After death the judgment." Let us profit by these lessons of the grave, and by the examples of those who are no more. Let us cling still more strongly to Jesus Christ, our Saviour and our God. He is "the Truth, the Resurrection, and the Life"; and the more we cling *to him*, the more we shall feel ourselves strong and resigned. When our friend took excursions through our beautiful mountains, he often said, "I am never alone." If you put your trust in Jesus Christ, you will never be *alone*; for, if we see in him a Saviour who died for our sins, we ought also to see a living Saviour, who is always near us, to strengthen us in the hour of trial, to console us in suffering, and to save us in the hour of death.

—Mr. Frossard terminated the ceremony by a fervent prayer for the family of the deceased, and for all present, and, after having repeated the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, the assembly separated.

SUMMARY.

The Senate of Rhode Island passed a bill Feb. 24th, restoring all the rights of a citizen of that State to Thomas W. Dorr. The bill passed by a majority of one vote.

Dr. Thadeus Clarke, the father of Grace Greenwood, died at his residence in New Brighton, Pa., a few days since. He was a very old man, who had seen much affliction.

It is reported that the new steamer now building according to the plan of General Norris, of Philadelphia, which is intended to make the run to Europe in six days, is sold to the Sultan of Turkey.

The ladies of South Carolina have formed a "Calhoun Monument Association," for the purpose of raising money by private subscription, to erect a monument to the memory of that statesman.

Douglas Jerrold says that—"As old mother Eve created the necessity of wearing the useful garment called a shirt, by the sons of Adam, therefore it is but right for her daughters to wash them."

Uncle Tom's Cabin is having a run in New Orleans. Although they borrowed the idea from Mrs. Stowe, it is hardly necessary to state that the play is somewhat modified from its original form as played at the North. It is made to suit the locality.

Five slaves are to be hung at Lancaster (S. C.), on the third Friday of March, for the murder of Alexander Craig. Two white men are to be also hung in Charleston about the same time, for the murder of a slave near Walterborough.

HEGIRA.—One more individual from Kentucky, Canadaward, was announced on the ferry boat on Saturday evening. A slave, the property of a planter, living some thirty miles from Carlton, crossed the river near the city, and made good his escape.—*Cincinnati Commercial*, 13th.

A lawyer arguing a case before Chief Justice Shaw, a few days since, dwelt with much earnestness upon the proverb, that "if you give another an *inch*, he will take an *ell*." "Yes," responded the Judge, "and hence the origin of *Lynch Law*!"

THE CANAL ELECTION.—Returns have now been received from all the Counties in the State, by which it appears that the whole number of votes cast was 246,221. Of this number, 185,768 are in favour of the amendment, and 60,493 against it. Majority for the amendment, 125,275.

A company of five negroes, the property of James Merton, of Gallatin Co., Ky., succeeded in making their escape, on the night of the 14th. They had only to cross the Ohio river when they were taken in charge by some friends who soon had them on their way to Canada by the "underground."

A FAIR HIT.—Senator Wade, in alluding to the declaration of Mr. Dixon, that the South, in going for Douglas's bill, were but *accepting* a boon proffered to them by the North, replied—"Sir, Major Andre was hung by the neck for accepting the treason proffered by Benedict Arnold."

A new play has been brought out in Washington, D. C., called "Woman's Rights." A correspondent of the *Star* speaks highly of it. None will more rejoice at this popular mode of bringing their movement into notice than the advocates of the doctrines it attempts to ridicule.

They say Mr. Douglas is going about declaring that he does n't want to be a candidate for the Presidency at the next election. It is a work of supererogation. He might spare himself the trouble. The man who engineers the repeal of the Missouri Compromise need n't feel anxious about his future prospects. Benedict Arnold is an example on that head.—*Tribune*.

The Sandusky *Register* thinks the fact that Douglas is trying to get a "pass" for his "Nebraska Bill," is strong presumptive evidence in the affirmative, on the disputed point as to whether he is the owner of negroes.

Mrs. Partington is a great contemner of nicknames, and thinks that if Mr. Douglas is the father of the Nebraska Bill, he ought to call it Bill Douglas, and not nickname his own offspring.

The New Bedford *Mercury* has seen a letter announcing that Mr. Theophilus T. Pritchard (formerly Pitcher), who was a native of Sippican, and well known in New Bedford, was recently murdered by his own slaves, upon his estate at Satartia, Miss. Mr. P. was killed by choking. Five of the murderers are in jail awaiting a trial, and have made confessions of the crime. Mr. Pritchard left a handsome estate.

COLONIZING SLAVEHOLDERS.—A correspondent of the Detroit *Democrat* proposes to colonize the 250,000 slaveholders, as they can be removed with much less expense than the four millions of slaves and free coloured people, now in the United States. He urges that the slaves are all passive and quiet, and that their masters are always kicking up a disturbance, and hence, that they are the class to colonize. Not a bad idea, by any means.

THE PROHIBITORY LAW IN MISSOURI.—The *Vicksburg Whig* of the 16th states that the bill which passed the lower branch of the Legislature last week, for the suppression of the liquor traffic, also passed the Senate on Tuesday evening, but with many amendments. If the amendments of the Senate go through the lower House, the bill will go into effect immediately after its passage. We have not seen the details of the bill.

THE MAINE LAW.—The Supreme Court have given their decision on the case recently argued before the full Bench, in which they sustain the constitutionality of the law. This decision will greatly strengthen the efforts now being made in the principal cities to enforce the law. We see that the Mayor and Aldermen of Lowell have adopted an order instructing the City Marshal and the Police officers to take measures to see that the law be enforced in that city.—*Boston Commonwealth*.

A drove of 1,600 turkeys, it is stated, are on their way from Smith County, Va., to Charleston, S. C., travelling seven miles a day, and eating seven bushels of corn, which are strown on the road before them. If these were the only kind of droves of bipeds driven Southward from the Old Dominion, its inland traffic would be altogether better than it now is. A State that makes merchandize alike of human beings and turkeys has a large step yet to take towards being a democratic Commonwealth.—*Christian Register*.

The editor of the Fredericksburg *News* says that he knows a family of wealth and respectability who have intermarried until there cannot be found in three of them a sound man or woman. One has sore eyes, another scrofula, a third is idiotic, a fourth is blind, a fifth bandy-legged, a sixth with a head about the size of a turnip, with not one out of the number exempt from physical or mental defects of some kind. Yet this family perseveres to intermarry with each other, with these living monuments constantly before them.

The Worcester *Transcript* contains the remonstrance of twelve hundred and fourteen of the citizens of Worcester against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Among the signers are Governor Washburn, John Davis, Levi Lincoln, and H. Bulloch. The remonstrance says: "We can regard the bill offered to the Senate as nothing less than a deliberate proposition to break down, by a positive act of legislation, an existing and legitimate barrier against the extension of Slavery into the Territories proposed to be established."

We learn that hydrophobia prevails to an alarming extent on the Indian reservation at Cattarangus Creek, New York. Several of the family of Bluesky, one of the chiefs of the tribe, within a few days, from eating the flesh of a cow which was bitten by a rabid dog, and Bluesky himself is thought to be beyond medical aid. The only improbable part of this story is about the Chiefs. The Indians on that Reservation have no Chiefs, having deposed them and formed a republic, several years since. The Bluesky, however, belonged to an old stock of Chiefs.

The Cecil *Democrat*, learns by a letter from Centreville, Md., that they had a very exciting time of it at the meeting of slaveholders, held in that town on Tuesday (14th ult.) The particulars are not stated but it is inferred to have arisen from a difference of opinion as to the best policy to be pursued towards the free people of colour, to prevent vagrancy and idleness; some being for more stringent measures, while others favoured a more mild and lenient course. It is said that from high words they nearly came to blows.—*West Chester (Pa.) Herald*.

MISS WEBSTER ORDERED TO LEAVE KENTUCKY.—Miss Delia Webster who was pardoned out of the Kentucky Penitentiary, where she was confined on a charge of abducting slaves, has received notice from the citizens of Trimble County that she must leave the State immediately. This is in consequence of the recent disappearance of a number of slaves, and the arrest of the Rev. Norris Day, at Madison, Ind., on the charge of abducting slaves. Day, it is alleged, is a partner of Miss Webster in the business, and the two, it is said, resided on a farm which they had purchased in Trimble County.

A SAD AND MYSTERIOUS AFFAIR.—On the 10th of January last, a man by the name of Nicholas Phillpot, a saddler and harness maker, in the employ of Mr. Ensign, in this village, was married in the Episcopal Church, and, in the evening, himself and bride, with about a dozen others, held a wedding party at Mrs. Peard's, in East Pembroke. Shortly after the party, all that attended were taken viol

THE LANDMARK OF FREEDOM.

Speech of Hon. Charles Sumner.

IN SENATE, Monday, Feb. 21, 1854.

MR. PRESIDENT: I approach this discussion with awe. The mighty question, with untold issues, which it involves, oppresses me. Like a portentous cloud, surcharged with irresistible storm and ruin, it seems to fill the whole heavens, making me painfully conscious how unequal I am to the occasion—how unequal, also, is all that I can say, to all that I feel.

In delivering my sentiments here to-day, I shall speak frankly—according to my convictions, without concealment or reserve. But if anything fell from the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas), in opening this discussion, which might seem to challenge a personal contest, I desire to say that I shall not enter upon it. Let not a word or a tone pass my lips to direct attention for a moment from the transcendent theme, by the side of which Senators and Presidents are but dwarfs. I would not forget those amenities which belong to this place, and are so well calculated to temper the antagonism of debate; nor can I cease to remember and to feel that amidst all diversities of opinion, we are the representatives of thirty-one sister republics, knit together by indissoluble ties, and constituting that Plural Unit which we all embrace by the endearing name of country.

The question presented for your consideration is not surpassed in grandeur by any which has occurred in our national history since the Declaration of Independence. In every aspect it assumes gigantic proportions, whether we simply consider the extent of territory it concerns, or the public faith, or national policy which it affects, or that higher question—that *Question of Questions*—as far above others as Liberty is above the common things of life—which it opens anew for judgment.

It concerns an immense region, larger than the original thirteen States, vying in extent with all the existing free States, stretching over prairie, field and forest—interlaced by silver streams, skirted by protecting mountains, and constituting the heart of the North American Continent—only a little smaller, let me add, than the three great European countries combined—Italy, Spain, and France, each of which, in succession, has dominated over the world. This territory has already been likened, on this floor, to the Garden of God. The similitude is found, not merely in its present pure and virgin character, but in its actual geographical situation, occupying central spaces on this Hemisphere, which, in their general relations, may well compare with that early Asiatic home. We are told that,

Southward through Eden went a river large;

so here we have a stream which is larger than the Euphrates. And here, too, amidst all the smiling products of nature, lavished by the hand of God, is the goodly tree of Liberty, planted by our fathers, which, without exaggeration, or even imagination, may be likened to

——the tree of life,
High eminent, blooming ambrosial fruit
Of vegetable gold.

It is with regard to this territory that you are now called to exercise the grandest function of the lawgiver, by establishing those rules of polity which will determine its future character. As the twig is bent the tree inclines; and the influences impressed upon the early days of an empire—like those upon a child—are of inconceivable importance to its future weal or woe. The bill now before us proposes to organize and equip two new territorial establishments, with governors, secretaries, legislative councils, legislators, judges, marshals, and the whole machinery of civil society. Such a measure, at any time, would deserve the most careful attention. But, at the present moment, it justly excites a peculiar interest, from the effort made—on pretences unsustained by facts—in violation of solemn covenant, and of the early principles of our fathers—to open this immense region to Slavery.

According to existing law, this Territory is now guarded against Slavery by a positive prohibition, embodied in the Act of Congress, approved March 6, 1820, preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, as a sister State, and in the following explicit words:

"SEC. 8. *Be it further enacted*, That in all that Territory *ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana*, which lies north of 36 deg. and 30 min. of north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, SLAVERY AND INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE, otherwise than as the punishment of crimes, SHALL BE, AND IS HEREBY, FOREVER PROHIBITED."

It is now proposed to set aside this prohibition; but there seems to be a singular indecision as to the way in which the deed shall be done. From the time of its first introduction, in the report of the Committee on Territories, the proposition has assumed different shapes; and it promises to assume as many as Proteus; now, one thing in form, and now another; now like a river, and then like a flame; but, in every form and shape, identical in substance; with but one end and aim—its be-all and end-all—the overthrow of the Prohibition of Slavery.

At first, it proposed simply to declare, that the States formed out of this Territory should be admitted into the Union, "with or without Slavery," and did not directly assume to touch this prohibition. For some reason this was not satisfactory, and then it was precipitately proposed to declare, that the prohibition in the Missouri act "was superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures, and is hereby declared inoperative." But this would not do; and it is now proposed to declare, that the Prohibition, "being inconsistent with the principles of non-intervention by Congress, with Slavery in the States and Territories, as recognised by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void."

All this is to be done on pretences founded upon the Slavery enactments of 1850; seeking with mingled audacity and cunning, "by indirection to find direction out." Now, Sir, I am not here to speak in behalf of those measures, or to lean in any way upon their support. Relating to different subject matters, contained in different acts, which prevailed successively at different times, and by different votes—some persons voting for one measure, and some voting for another, and very few voting for all, they cannot be regarded as a unit, embodying conditions of compact, or Compromise, if you please, adopted equally by all parties, and, therefore, obligatory on all parties. But since this broken series of measures has been adduced as an apology for the proposition now before us, I desire to say, that, such as they are, they cannot, by any effort of interpretation, by any distorting wand of power, by any perverse alchemy, be transmuted into a repeal of that original prohibition of Slavery.

On this head there are several points to which I would merely call attention, and then pass on. *First*, The Slavery enactments of 1850 did not pretend, in terms, to touch, much less to change, the condition of the Louisiana Territory, which was already fixed by Congressional enactment, but simply acted upon "newly acquired Territories," the condition of which was not already fixed by Congressional enactment. The two transactions related to different subject matters. *Secondly*, The enactments do not directly touch the subject of Slavery, during the territorial existence of Utah and New Mexico; but they provide prospectively, that, when admitted as States, they shall be received "with or without Slavery." Here certainly can be no overthrow of an act of Congress which directly concerns a territory *during its Territorial existence*. *Thirdly*, During all the discussion of those measures in Congress, and afterwards before the people, and through the public press, at the North and the South alike, no person was heard to intimate that the prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Act was in any way disturbed. And, *Fourthly*, The acts themselves contain a formal provision, that "nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify anything" in a certain article of the resolutions annexing Texas, wherein it is expressly declared that in territory north of the Missouri Compromise line, "Slavery, or involuntary servitude, except for crime, shall be prohibited."

But I do not dwell on these things. These pretences have been already amply refuted by Senators who have preceded me. It is clear, beyond all contradiction, that the prohibition of Slavery in this territory has not been superseded or in any way contravened by the Slavery acts of 1850. The proposition before you is, therefore, original in its character, without sanction from any former legislation; and it must, accordingly, be judged by its merits, as an original proposition.

Here let it be remembered, that the friends of Freedom are not open to any charge of aggression. They are now standing on the defensive, guarding the early entrenchments thrown up by our fathers. No proposition to abolish Slavery anywhere is now before you; but, on the contrary, a proposition to abolish Freedom. The term Abolitionist, which is so often applied in reproach, justly belongs, on this occasion, to him who would overthrow this well-established land mark. He is, indeed, no Abolitionist of Slavery; let him be called, Sir, an Abolitionist of Freedom. For myself, whether with many or few, my place is taken. Even if alone, my feeble arm shall not be wanting as a bar against this outrage.

On two distinct grounds, "both strong against the deed," I now arraign it: *First*, in the name of public faith, as an infraction of the solemn obligations assumed beyond recall by the South on the admission of Missouri into the Union as a slave State. *Secondly*, I arraign it in the name of Freedom, as an unjustifiable departure from the original Anti-Slavery policy of our fathers. These two heads I propose to consider in their order, glancing under the latter at the objections to the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories.

And here, Sir, before I approach the argument, indulge me with a few preliminary words on the character of this proposition. Slavery is the forcible subjection of one human being, in person, labour, or property, to the will of another. In this simple statement is involved its whole injustice. There is no offence against religion, against morals, against humanity, which may not stalk, in the license of this institution, "unwhipt of justice." For the husband and wife there is no marriage; for the mother there is no assurance that her infant child will not be ravished from her breast; for all who bear the name of Slave, there is nothing that they can call their own. Without a father, without a mother—almost without a God—the slave has nothing but a master. It would be contrary to that Rule of Right, which is ordained by God, if such a system, though mitigated often by a patriarchal kindness, and by a plausible physical comfort, could be otherwise than pernicious in its influences. It is confessed that the master suffers not less than the slave. And this is not all. The whole social fabric is disorganised; labour loses its dignity; industry sickens; education finds no schools; and all the land of Slavery is impoverished. And, now, sir, when the conscience of mankind is at last aroused to these things, when, throughout the civilized world, a slave dealer is a bye-word and a reproach, we, as a nation, are about to open a new market to the traffickers in flesh, who haunt the shambles of the South. Such an act, at this time, is removed from all reach of that palliation often vouchsafed to Slavery. This wrong, we are speciously told, by those who seek to defend it, is not our original sin. It was entailed upon us, so we are instructed, by our ancestors; and the responsibility is often, with exultation, thrown upon the mother country. Now, without stopping to inquire into the value of this apology, which is never adduced in behalf of other abuses, and which availed nothing against that kingly power, imposed by the mother country, and which our fathers overthrew, it is sufficient, for the present purpose, to know that it is now proposed to make Slavery our own original act. Here is a fresh case of actual transgression, which we cannot cast upon the shoulders of any progenitors, nor upon any mother country, distant in time or place. The Congress of the United States, the people of the United States, at this day, in this vaunted period of light, will be responsible for it, so that it shall be said hereafter, so long as the dismal history of Slavery is read, that, in the year of Christ 1854, a new and deliberate act was passed, by which a vast territory was opened to its inroads.

Alone in the company of nations does our country assume this hateful championship. In despotic Russia, the serfdom which constitutes the "peculiar institution" of that great Empire is never allowed to travel with the Imperial flag, according to the American pretension, into provinces newly acquired by the common blood and treasure, but is carefully restricted by positive prohibition, in harmony with the general conscience, within its ancient confines, and this prohibition—the Wilmot Proviso of Russia—is rigorously enforced on every side, in all the provinces, as in Bessarabia on the south, and Poland on the West, so that, in fact, no Russian nobleman has been able to move into these important territories with his slaves. Thus Russia speaks for Freedom, and disowns the slaveholding dogma of our country. Far away in the East, at "the gateways of the day," in effeminate India, Slavery has been condemned; in Constantinople, the queenly seat of the most powerful Mahomedan Empire, where barbarism still mingles with civilization, the Ottoman Sultan has fastened upon it the stigma of disapprobation; the Barbary States of Africa, occupying the same parallels of latitude with the slave States of our Union, and resembling them in the nature of their boundaries, their productions, their climate, and the "peculiar institution," which sought shelter in both, have been changed into Abolitionists. Algiers, seated near the line of 36 deg. 30 min., has been dedicated to Freedom. Morocco, by it untutored ruler, has expressed its desire, stamped in the formal terms of a treaty, that the very name of Slavery may perish from the minds of men; and only recently, from the Dey of Tunis has proceeded that noble act, by which, "In honour of God, and to distinguish man from the brute creation"—I quote his own words—he decreed its total Abolition throughout his dominions. Let Christian America be willing to be taught by these examples. God forbid that our Republic—"heir of all the ages, foremost in the files of time"—should adopt anew the barbarism which they have renounced.

As the effort now making is extraordinary in character, so no assumption seems too extraordinary to be wielded in its support. The primal truth of the equality of men, as proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence, has been assailed, and this great charter of our country discredited. Sir, you and I will soon pass away, but that will continue to stand above impeachment or question. The Declaration of Independence was a declaration of rights, and the language employed, though general in its character, must obviously be restrained within the design and sphere of a declaration of rights, involving no such absurdity as was attributed to it yesterday by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Petitt.)

Sir, it is a palpable fact that men are not born equal in physical strength or in mental capacities, in beauty of form or health of body. These mortal cloaks of flesh differ, as do these worldly garments. Diversity or inequality in these respects is the law of creation.

But as God is no respecter of persons, and as all are equal in his sight, whether Dives or Lazarus, master or slave, so are all equal in nature, in natural inborn rights; and pardon me if I say it is a vain sophism to adduce in argument against this vital axiom of liberty, the physical or mental inequalities by which men are characterized, or the unhappy degradation to which in violation of a common brotherhood they are doomed. To deny the Declaration of Independence is to rush on the bosses of the shield of the Almighty, which, in all respects, the present measure seems to do.

To the delusive suggestion of the able Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Badger), that by the overthrow of this prohibition, the number of slaves will not be increased, that there will be simply a beneficent diffusion of Slavery, and not its extension, I reply at once, that this argument, if of any value—if not mere words and nothing else—would equally justify and require the overthrow of the prohibition of Slavery in the free States, and, indeed, everywhere throughout the world. All the dikes, which, in different countries, from time to time, with the march of civilization, have been painfully set up against the inroads of this evil, must be removed and every land opened anew to its destructive flood. It is clear, beyond dispute, that by the overthrow of this prohibition, Slavery will be quickened, and slaves themselves will be multiplied, while new "room and verge" will be secured for the gloomy operations of slave law, under which free labour will droop, and a vast territory will be smitten with sterility. Sir, a blade of grass would not grow where the horse of Attila had trod; nor can any true prosperity spring up in the footprints of the slave.

But it is suggested that slaves will not be carried into Nebraska in large numbers, and that, therefore, the question is of small practical moment. My distinguished colleague (Mr. Everett), in his eloquent speech, adopted this suggestion, and allowed himself, while upholding the prohibition, to disparage its importance in a manner, from which I feel constrained kindly, but most strenuously, to dissent. Sir, the census shows that it is of vital consequence. There is Missouri at this moment, with Illinois on the east and Nebraska on the west, all covering nearly the same spaces of latitude, and resembling each other in soil, climate and productions. Mark, now, the contrast! By the potent efficacy of the Ordinance of the North-western Territory, Illinois is now a free State, while Missouri has 87,422 slaves, and the simple question which challenges an answer is, whether Nebraska shall be preserved in the condition of Illinois, or surrendered to that of Missouri? Surely this cannot be treated lightly. But for myself, I am unwilling to measure the exigency of the prohibition by the number of persons, whether many or few, whom it may protect. Human rights, whether in a solitary individual or a vast multitude, are entitled to an equal and unhesitating support. In this spirit, the flag of our country only recently became the impenetrable panoply of an homeless wanderer, who claimed its protection in a distant sea; and in this spirit, I am constrained to declare that there is no place accessible to human avarice, or human lust, or human force, whether in the lowest valley, or on the loftiest mountain top, whether on the broad flower-spangled prairies, or the snowy crests of the Rocky Mountains, where the prohibition of Slavery, like the commandments of the Decalogue, should not go.

But leaving these things behind, I press at once to the argument.

1. And now, Sir, in the name of that public faith, which is the very ligament of civil society, and which the great Roman orator tells us it is detestable to break even with an enemy, I arraign this scheme, and hold it up to the judgment of all who hear me. There is an early Italian story of an experienced citizen, who, when his nephew told him he had been studying, at the University of Bologna, the science of *right*, said in reply, "You have spent your time to little purpose. It would have been better had you learned the science of *might*, for that is worth two of the other;" and the bystanders of that day all agreed that the veteran spoke the truth. I begin, Sir, by assuming that honourable Senators will not act in this spirit—that they will not substitute *might* for *right*—that they will not wantonly and flagitiously discard any obligation, pledge, or covenant, because they chance to possess the power; but that, as honest men, desirous to do right, they will confront this question.

Sir, the proposition before you involves not merely the repeal of an existing law, but the infraction of solemn obligations originally proposed and assumed by the South, after a protracted and embittered contest, as a convenant of peace—with regard to certain specified territory therein described, namely: "All that Territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana;" according to which, in consideration of the admission into the Union of Missouri as a slave State, Slavery was forever prohibited in all the remaining part of this Territory which lies north of 36 deg. 30 min. This arrangement, between different sections of the Union—the slave States of the first part and the free States of the second part—though usually known as the Missouri Compromise, was at the time styled a COMPACT. In its stipulations for Slavery, it was justly repugnant to the conscience of the North, and ought never to have been made; but it has on that side been performed. And now the unperformed outstanding obligations to Freedom, originally proposed and assumed by the South, are resisted.

Years have passed since these obligations were embodied in the legislation of Congress, and accepted by the country. Meanwhile, the statesmen by whom they were framed and vindicated have, one by one, dropped from this earthly sphere. Their living voices cannot now be heard to plead for the preservation of that public faith to which they were pledged. But this extraordinary lapse of time, with the complete fruition by one party of all the benefits belonging to it, under the compact, gives to the transaction an added and most sacred strength. Prescription steps in with new bonds, to confirm the original work; to the end that while men are mortal, controversies shall not be immortal. Death, with inexorable scythe, has mowed down the authors of this compact; but, with conservative hour-glass, it has counted out a succession of years, which now defile before us, like so many sentinels, to guard the sacred landmark of Freedom.

A simple statement of facts, derived from the journals of Congress and contemporary records, will show the origin and nature of this compact, the influence by which it was established, and the obligations which it imposed.

As early as 1818, at the first session of the Fifteenth Congress, a bill was reported to the House of Representatives, authorizing the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, for the admission of such State into the Union; but, at that session, no final action was had thereon. At the next session, in February, 1819, the bill was again brought forward, when an eminent Representative of New York, whose life has been spared till this last summer, Mr. James Tallmadge, moved a clause prohibiting any further introduction of slaves into the proposed State, and securing Freedom to the children born within the State after its admission into the Union, on attaining twenty-five years of age. This important proposition, which assumed a power not only to prohibit the ingress of Slavery into the State itself, but also to abolish it there, was passed in the affirmative, after a vehement debate of three days. On a division of the question, the first part, prohibiting the further introduction of slaves, was adopted by 87 yeas to 76 nays; the second part, providing for the emancipation of children, was adopted by 82 yeas to 78 nays. Other propositions to thwart the operation of these amendments were voted down, and on the 17th of February the bill was read a third time, and passed, with these important restrictions.

In the Senate, after debate, the provision for the emancipation of children was struck out by 31 yeas to 7 nays; the other provision, against the further introduction of Slavery, was struck out by 22 yeas to 16 nays. Thus emasculated, the bill was returned to the House, which, on March 2, by a vote of 78 nays to 76 yeas, refused its concurrence. The Senate adhered to their amendments, and the House, by 78 yeas to 66 nays, adhered to their disagreement; and so at this session the Missouri bill was lost; and here was a temporary triumph of Freedom.

Meanwhile, the same controversy was renewed on the bill pending at the same time for the organization of the Territory of Arkansas, then known as the southern part of the Territory of Missouri. The restrictions already adopted in the Missouri bill were moved by Mr. Taylor, of New York, subsequently Speaker; but after at least six close votes, on the yeas and nays, in one of which the House was equally divided, 88 yeas to 88 nays, they were lost. Another proposition by Mr. Taylor, simpler in form, that Slavery should not hereafter be introduced into this territory, was lost by 90 nays to 86 yeas; and the Arkansas bill, on Feb. 25, was read the third time and passed. In the Senate, Mr. Burrill, of Rhode Island, moved, as an amendment, the prohibition of the further introduction of Slavery into this Territory, which was lost by 19 nays to 14 yeas. And thus, without any provision for Freedom, Arkansas was organized as a Territory; and here was a triumph of Slavery.

At this same session, Alabama was admitted as a slave State, without any restriction or objection.

It was in the discussion on the Arkansas bill, at this session, that we find the earliest suggestion of a Compromise. Defeated in his efforts to prohibit Slavery in the Territory, Mr. Taylor stated that "he thought it important that some line should be designated beyond which Slavery should not be permitted," and he moved its prohibition hereafter in all territories of the United States north of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, *without any exception of Missouri, which is north of this line.* This proposition, though withdrawn after debate, was at once welcomed by Mr. Livermore, of New Hampshire, "as made in the true spirit of Compromise." It was opposed by Mr. Rhea, of Tennessee, on behalf of Slavery, who avowed himself against every restriction; and also by Mr. Ogle, of Pennsylvania, on behalf of Freedom, who was "against any Compromise by which Slavery, in any of the Territories, should be recognised or sanctioned by Congress." In this spirit it was opposed and supported by others; among whom was General Harrison, afterwards President of the United States, who "assented to the expediency of establishing some such line of discrimination;" but proposed a line due west from the mouth of the Des Moines, thus constituting the northern, and not the Southern boundary of Missouri, the partition line between Freedom and Slavery.

But this idea of Compromise, though suggested by Taylor, was thus early adopted and vindicated in this very debate, by an eminent character—Mr. Louis McLane, of Delaware—who has since held high office in the country, and enjoyed no common measure of public confidence. Of all the leading actors in these early scenes, he and Mr. Mercer alone are yet spared. On this occasion he said:

"The fixing of a line on the west of the Mississippi north of which Slavery should not be tolerated, *had always been with him a favourite policy*, and he hoped the day was not distant when, upon principles of *fair compromise*, it might constitutionally be effected. The present attempt he regarded as premature."

After opposing the restriction on Missouri, he concluded by declaring:

"At the same time, I do not mean to abandon the policy to which I alluded in the commencement of my remarks. I think it but fair that both sections of the Union should be accomodated on this subject, with regard to which so much feeling has been manifested. The same great motives of policy which reconciled and harmonized the jarring and discordant elements of our system originally, and which enabled the framers of our happy Constitution to compromise the different interests which then prevailed on this and other subjects, if properly cherished by us, will enable us to achieve similar objects. If we meet upon principles of reciprocity, we cannot fail to do justice to all. *It has already been avowed, by gentlemen on this floor from the South and the West, that they will agree upon a line which shall divide the slaveholding from the non-slaveholding States. It is this proposition I am anxious to effect; but I wish to effect it by some compact which shall be binding upon all parties, and all subsequent Legislatures:* which cannot be changed, and will not fluctuate with the diversity of feeling and of sentiment to which this Empire, in its march, must be destined. There is a vast and immense tract of country west of the Mississippi, yet to be settled, and intimately connected with the Northern section of the Union, upon which this Compromise can be effected."

The suggestions of Compromise were at this time vain; each party was determined. The North, by the prevailing voice of its representatives, claimed all for Freedom; the South, by its potential command of the Senate, claimed all for Slavery.

The report of this debate aroused the country. For the first time in our history, Freedom, after an animated struggle, hand to hand, had been kept in check by Slavery. The original policy of our Fathers in the restriction of Slavery was suspended, and this giant wrong threatened to stalk into all the broad national domain. Men at the North were humbled and amazed. The imperious demands of Slavery seemed incredible. Meanwhile, the whole subject was adjourned from Congress to the people. Through the press and at public meetings, an earnest voice was raised against the admission of Missouri into the Union without the restriction of Slavery. Judges left the bench and clergymen the pulpit, to swell the indignant protest which arose from good men, without distinction of party or of pursuit.

The movement was not confined to a few persons, nor to a few States. A public meeting, at Trenton, in New Jersey, was followed by others in New York and Philadelphia, and finally at Worcester, Salem and Boston, where committees were organized to rally the country. The citizens of Baltimore, convened at the Court-House, with the Mayor in the chair, resolved that the future admission of slaves into the States hereafter formed west of the Mississippi, ought to be prohibited by Congress. Villages, towns, and cities, by memorial, petition and prayer, called upon Congress to maintain the great principle of the prohibition of Slavery. The same principle was also commended by the resolutions of State Legislatures; and Pennsylvania, inspired by the teachings of Franklin, and the convictions of the respectable denomination of Friends, unanimously asserted at once the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit Slavery west of the Mississippi, and solemnly appealed to her sister States "to refuse to covenant with crime." New Jersey and Delaware followed, both also unanimously. Ohio asserted the same principle; so did also Indiana. The latter State, not content with providing for the future, severely censured one of its Senators, for his vote to organize Arkansas without the prohibition of Slavery. The resolutions of New York were reinforced by the recommendation of De Witt Clinton.

Amidst these excitements, Congress came together in December, 1819, taking possession of these Halls of the Capitol for the first time since their desolation by the British. On the day after the receipt of the President's Message, two several Committees of the House were constituted, one to consider the application of Maine, and the other of Missouri, to enter the Union as separate and independent States. With only the delay of a single day, the bill for the admission of Missouri was reported to the House without the restriction of Slavery; but, as if shrinking from the immediate discussion of the great question it involved, afterwards, on the motion of Mr. Mercer, of Virginia, its consideration was postponed for several weeks; all which, be it observed, is in open contrast with the manner in which the present discussion has been precipitated upon Congress. Meanwhile the Maine bill, when reported to the House, was promptly acted upon, and sent to the Senate.

In the interval between the report of the Missouri bill and its consideration by the House, a Committee was constituted, on motion of Mr. Taylor, of New York, to inquire into the expediency of prohibiting the introduction of Slavery into the Territories west of the Mississippi. This Committee, at the end of a fortnight, was discharged from further consideration of the subject, which, it was understood, would enter into the postponed debate on the Missouri bill. This early effort to interdict Slavery in the Territories by a special law is worthy of notice, on account of some of the expressions of opinion which it drew forth. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Taylor declared that

"He presumed there were no members—he knew of none—who doubted the constitutional power of Congress to impose such a restriction on the Territories."

A generous voice from Virginia recognised at once the right and duty of Congress. This was from Charles Fenton Mercer, who declared that

"When the question proposed should come fairly before the House, he should support the proposition He should record his vote against suffering the dark cloud of inhumanity, which now darkened his country, from rolling on beyond the peaceful shores of the Mississippi."

At length, on the 26th of January, 1820, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Missouri bill, and proceeded with its discussion, day by day, till the 28th of February, when it was reported back with amendments. But meanwhile, the same question was presented to the Senate, where a conclusion was reached earlier than in the House. A clause for the admission of Missouri was moved by way of tack to the Maine bill. To this an amendment was moved by Mr. Roberts, of Pennsylvania, prohibiting the further introduction of Slavery into the State, which, after a fortnight's debate, was defeated by 27 nays to 16 yeas.

The debate in the Senate was of unusual interest and splendour. It was especially illustrated by an effort of transcendent power, from that great lawyer and orator, William Pinkney. Recently returned from a succession of missions to Foreign Courts, and at this time the acknowledged chief of the American bar, particularly skilled in questions of constitutional law, his course as a Senator from Maryland was calculated to produce a profound impression. In a speech which drew to this chamber an admiring throng for two days, and which at the time was fondly compared with the best examples of Greece and Rome, he first authoritatively proposed and developed the Missouri Compromise. His masterly effort was mainly directed against the restriction upon Missouri, but it began and ended with the idea of Compromise. "Notwithstanding," he says, "occasional appearances of rather an unfavourable description, I have long since persuaded myself that the *Missouri question*, as it is called, might be laid to rest, with innocence and safety, by some *conciliatory Compromise* at least, by which, as is our duty, we might reconcile the extremes of conflicting views and feelings, without any sacrifice of constitutional principles." And he closed with the hope that the restriction on Missouri would not be pressed, but that the whole question "might be disposed of in a manner satisfactory to all, *by a prospective prohibition of Slavery in the Territory to the north and west of Missouri.*"

This authoritative proposition of Compromise, from the most powerful advocate of the unconditional admission of Missouri, was made in the Senate on the 21st of January. From various indications, it seems to have found prompt favour in that body. Finally, on the 17th of February, the union of Maine and Missouri in one bill prevailed there, by 23 Yeas to 21 Nays. On the next day, Mr. Thomas, of Illinois, who had always voted with the South against any restriction upon Missouri, introduced the famous clause prohibiting Slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min., which now constitutes the eighth section of the Missouri act. An effort was made to include the Arkansas Territory within this prohibition; but the South united against this extension of the area of Freedom, and it was defeated by 24 Nays to 20 Yeas. The prohibition, as moved by Mr. Thomas, then prevailed, by 34 Yeas to only 10 Nays. Among those in the affirmative were both the Senators from each of the slave States, Louisiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, Delaware, Maryland, and Alabama, and also one of the Senators from each of the slave States, Mississippi and North Carolina, including in the honourable list the familiar names of William Pinkney, James Brown, and William Rufus King.

This bill, as thus amended, is the first legislative embodiment of the Missouri Compact or Compromise, the essential conditions of which were the admission of Missouri as a State, without any restriction of Slavery; and the prohibition of Slavery in all the remaining Territory of Louisiana north of 36 deg. 30 min. This bill, thus composed, containing these two propositions—this double measure—finally passed the Senate by a test vote of 24 Yeas to 20 Nays. The Yeas embraced every Southern Senator except Nathaniel Macon, of North Carolina, and William Smith, of South Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER (interrupting). Mr. Gaillard voted with Mr. Smith.

Mr. SUMNER. No, sir. The name of John Gaillard, Senator from South Carolina, is found in favour of the Compromise. I speak with the Journal in my hand, and now repeat, that the yeas embraced every Southern Senator, except Mr. Macon and Mr. Smith. The Nays embraced every Northern Senator except the two Senators from Illinois, and one Senator from Rhode Island, and one from New Hampshire. And this, Sir, is the record of the first stage in the adoption of the Missouri Compromise. First openly announced and vindicated on the floor of the Senate by a distinguished Southern statesman, it was forced on the North by an almost unanimous Southern vote.

While things had thus culminated in the Senate, discussion was still proceeding in the other House on the original Missouri bill. This was for a moment arrested by the reception from the Senate of the Maine bill embodying the Missouri Compromise. Upon this, the debate was brief and the decision prompt. But here, even at this stage, as at every other, a Southern Statesman intervenes. Mr. Smith, of Maryland, for many years an eminent Senator of that State, but at this time a Representative, while opposing the restriction on Missouri, vindicated the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories:

"Mr. S. Smith said, that he rose principally with a view to state his understanding of the proposed amendment, viz: that it retained the boundaries of Missouri, as delineated in the bill; that it prohibited the admission of slaves west of the west line of Missouri, and north of the north line; that it did not interfere with the Territory of Arkansas, or the uninhabited land west thereof. *He thought the proposition not exceptionable;* but doubted the propriety of its forming a part of the bill. He considered the power of Congress over the territory as supreme, unlimited, before its admission; that Congress could impose on its Territories any restrictions it thought proper; that if citizens go into the Territories thus restricted, they cannot carry with them slaves. They will be without slaves, and will be educated with prejudices and habits such as will exclude all desire on their part to admit Slavery, when they shall become sufficiently numerous to be admitted as a State. And this is the advantage proposed by the amendment."

But the House was not disposed to barter the substantial restriction of Slavery in Missouri, for what seemed its unsubstantial-prohibition in an unsettled Territory. The Compromise was rejected, and the bill left in its original condition. This was done by large votes. Even the prohibition of Slavery was thrown out by 159 Yeas to 18 Nays—both the North and the South uniting against it. The Senate, on receiving the bill back from the House, insisted on their amendments. The House in turn insisted on their disagreement. According to parliamentary usage, a Committee of Conference between the two Houses was appointed. Mr. Thomas, of Illinois; Mr. Pinkney, of Maryland; and Mr. James Barbour, of Virginia, composed this important committee on the part of the Senate; and Mr. Holmes, of Maine; Mr. Taylor, of New York; Mr. Lowndes, of South Carolina; Mr. Parker, of Massachusetts; and Mr. Kinsey, of New Jersey, on the part of the House.

Meanwhile, the House had voted on the original Missouri bill. An amendment, peremptorily interdicting all Slavery in the new State, was adopted by 94 yeas to 86 nays; and thus the bill passed the House, and was sent to the Senate, March 1. Thus, after an exasperated and protracted discussion, the two Houses were at a dead-lock. The double-headed Missouri Compromise was the ultimatum of the Senate. The restriction of Slavery in Missouri, involving, of course, its prohibition in the unorganized Territories, was the ultimatum of the House.

At this stage, on the 2d of March, the Committee of Conference made their report, which was urged at once upon the House by Mr. Lowndes, the distinguished Representative from South Carolina, and one of her most precious sons. And here, Sir, at the mention of this name, yet fragrant among us, let me stop for one moment this current of history, to express the tender admiration with which I am inspired. Mr. Lowndes died before my recollection of political events; but he is endeared by that single sentiment—*that the Presidency is an office never to be sought*—which, by its beauty, shames the vileness of aspiration in our day, and will ever live as an amaranthine flower. Such a man at any time is a host; but he now threw his great heart into the work. He objected to a motion to print, on the ground "that it would imply a determination in the House to delay a decision of the subject to-day, which he had hoped the House was fully prepared for." The question then came, on striking out the restriction in the Missouri bill. The report in the *National Intelligencer* says:

"Mr. LOWNDES spoke briefly in support of the Compromise recommended by the Committee of Conference, and urged with great earnestness the propriety of a decision which would restore tranquility to the country, which was demanded by every consideration of discretion, of moderation, of wisdom, and of virtue.

"Mr. MERCER, of Virginia, followed on the same side with great earnestness and had spoken about half an hour when he was compelled by indisposition to resume his seat."

In conformity with this report, this disturbing question was at once put at rest. Maine and Missouri were each admitted into the Union as independent States. The restriction of Slavery in Missouri was abandoned by a vote in the House of 90 yeas to 87 nays; and the prohibition of Slavery in all Territories North of 36 deg. 30 min., exclusive of Missouri, was substituted by a vote of 134 yeas to 42 nays. Among the distinguished Southern names in the affirmative, are Louis McLane, of Delaware; Samuel Smith, of Maryland; William Lowndes, of South Carolina; and Charles Fenton Mercer, of Virginia. The title of the Missouri bill was amended in conformity with this prohibition, by adding the words, "and to prohibit Slavery in certain Territories." The bills then passed both Houses without a division; and on the morning of the 3d March, 1820, the *National Intelligencer* contained an exulting article, entitled: "The Question Settled."

Another paper published in Baltimore, immediately after its passage, vindicated it as a perpetual compact, which could not be disturbed. The language is so clear and strong that I will read it, although it has been already quoted by my friend from Ohio (Mr. Chase):

"*It is true, the Compromise is supported only by the letter of the law, repeatable by the authority which enacted it: but the circumstances of the case give this law a* MORAL FORCE *equal to that of a positive provision of the Constitution; and we do not hazard anything by saying that the Constitution exists in its observance.* Both parties have sacrificed much by conciliation. *We wish to see the* COMPACT *kept in good faith*, and we trust that a kind Providence will open the way to relieve us of an evil which every good citizen deprecates as the supreme curse of the country."
—*Niles's Register.*

Sir, the distinguished leaders in this settlement were all from the South. As early as Feb., 1819, Louis McLane, of Delaware, had urged it upon Congress, "by some compact binding upon all subsequent Legislatures." It was, in 1820, brought forward and upheld in the Senate by Wm. Pinkney, of Maryland, and passed in that body by the vote of every Southern Senator except two, against the vote of every Northern Senator except four. It was welcomed in the House by Samuel Smith, of Maryland. The Committee of Conference, through which it finally prevailed, was filled, on the part of the Senate, with inflexible partisans of the South, such as might fitly represent the sentiments of its President *pro tem.*, John Gaillard, a Senator from South Carolina. On the part of the House, it was nominated by Henry Clay, the Speaker, and Representative from Kentucky. This Committee, thus constituted, drawing its double life from the South, was unanimous in favour of the Compromise. A private letter from Mr. Pinkney, written at the time, and preserved by his distinguished biographer, shows that the report made by the Committee came from him.

"The bill for the admission of Missouri into the Union (*without* restriction as to Slavery) may be considered as past. The bill was sent back again this morning from the House, *with the restriction as to Slavery.* The Senate voted to amend it by striking out the restriction (27 to 15), and proposed, as another amendment, what I have all along been the advocate of—a restriction upon the vacant territory to the North and West as to Slavery. To-night the House of Representatives have agreed to *both* of these amendments, in opposition to their former votes, and this affair is settled. To-morrow we shall (of course) recede from our amendments as to Maine (our object being effected), and both States will be admitted. This happy result has been accomplished by the Conference, of which I was a member on the part of the Senate, and of which I proposed the report which has been made."

Thus again the Compromise takes its life from the South. Proposed in the Committee by Mr. Pinkney, it was urged on the House of Representatives, with great earnestness, by Mr. Lowndes, of South Carolina, and Mr. Mercer, of Virginia; and here again is the most persuasive voice of the South. When passed by Congress, it next came before the President, James Monroe, of Virginia, for his approval, who did not sign it till after the unanimous opinion of his Cabinet, in writing—composed of John Quincy Adams, Wm. H. Crawford, Smith Thompson, John C. Calhoun, and William Wirt—a majority of whom were Southern men—that the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories was constitutional. Thus yet again the Compromise takes its life from the South.

As the Compromise took its life from the South, so the South, in the judgment of its own statesmen at the time, and according to unquestionable facts, was the conquering party. It gained forthwith its darling desire, the first and essential stage in the admission of Missouri as a slave State, consummated at the next session of Congress, and subsequently the admission of Arkansas, also as a slave State. From the crushed and humble North it received more than the full consideration stipulated in its favour. On the side of the North the contract has been more than executed. And now the South refuses to perform the part which it originally proposed and assumed. With the consideration in its pocket, it repudiates the bargain which it forced upon the country. This, sir, is a simple statement of the present question.

A subtle German has declared that he could find heresies in the Lord's Prayer—and, I believe it is only in this spirit that any flaw can be found in the existing obligations of this compact. As late as 1848, in the discussions of this body, the Senator from Virginia, who sits behind me (Mr. Mason), while condemning it in many aspects, says:

"Yet as it was agreed to as a Compromise by the *South* for the sake of the Union, *I would be the last to disturb it.*"—*Congressional Globe, Appendix, 1st Session, 30th Congress. Vol 19, p. 887.*

Even this distinguished Senator recognised it as an obligation which he would not disturb. And, though disbelieving the original constitutionality of the arrangement, he was clearly right. I know, Sir, that it is in form simply a legislative act; but as the Act of Settlement in England, declaring the rights and liberties of the subject and settling the succession of the Crown, has become a permanent part of the British Constitution, irrepeal